

MODERN SPIRITUALISM

II

THE CAUSES OF PAST FAILURE

FROM the data furnished in my previous article it is clear that the Spiritualistic movement in the United States, which started with such tremendous energy, had spent its force in a quarter of a century, and that, regarded as a serious menace to orthodox Christian belief, it was in 1875 practically speaking moribund. From that time forth Spiritualism in the land of its birth has been no more than an undistinguished unit in a crowd of fantastic rival cults. It would hardly be an exaggeration to say that Theosophy, Christian Science, and eventually New Thought, were founded upon its ruins. I have previously quoted an editorial in *The Spiritualist* newspaper for February 12, 1875, which made frank avowal of the lamentable set back which the adherents of the cause had sustained. Ten months later another leading article in the same journal reverted to the subject in the following terms.

Strange changes have taken place in Spiritualism in America: there was a time when two or three thousand Spiritualists attended the Sunday services in the Boston Music-hall, whereas now only a hundred or two are to be seen there. Mrs. Hardinge¹ has withdrawn from the rostrum, because she does not like the way in which the business of Spiritualism is transacted in that country; and altogether a temporary reaction has set in. We attribute this to the circumstance that little or no deep research or scientific observation of phenomena has been carried on there, so that little real knowledge has been acquired; but mediums have been multiplying faster than the dangers and advantages of mediumship have been unravelled, and half-educated talkers have uttered much nonsense, mixed with a little intelligence, from public

¹ Mrs. Hardinge, afterwards known as Emma Hardinge Britten, was an Englishwoman by birth, who became in the U.S.A. a famous medium, lecturer, and writer on Spiritualism.

platforms, and, with no standard of excellence imposed upon them by the body at large, have imperfectly and ill-advisedly mooted many wild social problems in the name of Spiritualism.¹

Naturally the editor, having consideration for the feelings of his fellow Spiritualists, speaks in guarded language. He talks of "a temporary reaction," but he goes on in the same article to deprecate indiscriminate proselytism. It is more important, he urges, to make a careful study of mediumship and to investigate the laws and facts of Spiritualism. "Those who in their haste wish to rise like a rocket, must expect to fall like its stick,"—which is a not inapt description of what had actually happened—and he ends with the aphorism that "vertical growth is more required than lateral extension in the present state of the Spiritual movement." Practically speaking, this amounts to an admission that promiscuous dabbling in the occult was bound to prove harmful to the man in the street whose dominant motive is an unhealthy curiosity and who is devoid of the education or guidance which could enable him to exercise his critical faculties. In any case the set back to American Spiritualism in the 'seventies is a fact beyond dispute, and we may very well follow the English editor's example in asking ourselves what were the causes which brought it about.

There can be little doubt that for one thing the devotees of the cult had wearied and found that there was nothing in it. Though thousands of people tried to develop as mediums, the mysterious faculty, whatever be its nature, is possessed by only a small proportion of mankind. First-class mediums are extraordinarily scarce and still more rare is the good medium who has the strength of character to maintain his or her moral integrity. With indifferent and decadent mediums, inane, worthless or lying communications predominate. When the first wonder has worn off that any sort of intelligent answers should be returned at all, people discover that they really learn nothing. Mr. Horace Greeley, a man of exceptionally well-balanced judgment, was deeply interested in the early manifestations of Spiritualism. He investigated it conscientiously, was in touch with the best mediums, and

¹ *The Spiritualist*, Nov. 5, 1875, p. 217. This journal had also previously referred to the matter on Aug. 13th (p. 82), citing as the source of its information "the American spiritual newspapers which came to hand a few days ago."

remained to the end convinced of the reality of many of its physical as well as its mental phenomena. Writing in 1868, the lady mentioned above, Emma Hardinge, in her book, "Modern American Spiritualism," states that, as editor of *The Tribune*, Mr. Greeley's "generous and manly treatment of the matter through its columns had already exposed him to the calumnious sneers, which are everywhere directed against those who, without avowed partisanship for the subject, ventured even to treat it with candid impartiality."¹ But, without invoking any sort of religious motive, Greeley, at a later date, pronounced definitely against Spiritualism.

The so-called spirit communications [he wrote] are vague, unreal, shadowy, trivial. They have added little or nothing to our knowledge. . . . I do not know that they proceed from those who are said to be their authors, nor from the spirits of the departed at all. Certain developments indicate that they do, others that they do not.²

This also was the attitude of Lloyd Garrison of *The Liberator*³ and of a number of other prominent Americans who, being contemporaries of the movement from its earliest stages, were large-minded enough to make it the subject of serious inquiry. On this side of the Atlantic the conclusions of the late Earl of Dunraven were precisely similar. No man ever had better opportunities for investigation. For a year or more he lived in almost daily contact with D. D. Home, the greatest of mediums, when he was at the height of his powers. Lord Dunraven was always convinced of the genuineness of the physical phenomena, but he writes:

My own experiences took place more than fifty years ago and since then I have taken no active interest in the

¹ Hardinge, "Modern American Spiritualism" (4th Edn., New York, 1870), p. 71.

² See Greeley, "Recollections of a Busy Life" (New York, 1869), pp. 234-241; and *THE MONTH*, April, 1920, pp. 346-354. At first it was hoped that the spirits from the plenitude of their superior knowledge would lend invaluable aid in the solution of the problems of science, history, archaeology, etc. But soon all such anticipations were abandoned. M. Flammarion, throughout his life an ardent Spiritualist, proclaimed at an early date that the communications obtained through mediums and automatic writing "have not led science forward one single step; nor has any obscure, mysterious or illusive point in history been cleared up by the spirits."

³ "Life of Lloyd Garrison," Vol. III., pp. 375-376, and cf. *The Liberator*, April 11, 1851 and 1852 *passim*.

subject. I abandoned it for several reasons. Phenomena were all of the same character. I "got no forrader." I found that I made no progress, or at any rate not sufficient progress to warrant further investigation that was not very congenial to me, and was for some reason or other physically exhausting. I observed that some devotees were inclined to dangerous extremes, and became so much possessed by the idea of spiritual guidance in the everyday affairs of life as to undermine their self-dependence and to weaken their will-power.¹

In the same context Lord Dunraven goes on to declare that he could never satisfy himself as to the identity of the spirits which purported to communicate through Home when entranced. There were times when the medium seemed to reproduce perfectly the habits of thought, the tricks of speech and the very accent of those whom Lord Dunraven himself had known well before they passed into another world. On other occasions, however, the impersonation was quite unconvincing and the communicators appeared ignorant of many things which it was inconceivable that they should have forgotten.

Not less remarkable is the testimony of the English barrister, Mr. H. D. Jencken, who as the husband of Katie Fox, one of the two foundresses of modern Spiritualism, must have had endless opportunities of investigating the subject. On November 22, 1875, Mr. Jencken, presiding in London over a meeting of the National Association of Spiritualists, delivered an address on the unreliability of communications received through mediums. At the expense of a rather long quotation, it seems worth while to reproduce the exact terms in which *The Spiritualist* reported the most significant passage in his speech.

So far as he (Mr. Jencken) had seen, an objectless waste of power in telling lies characterized a large proportion of spiritual communications. Why was this? Was it that the messages came from very inferior beings who surrounded particular individuals? Circumstances such as these very much opposed the progress of Spiritualism. Once spirit messages were firmly believed in in

¹ Dunraven, "Past-times and Pastimes" (1922), Vol. I., p. 11.

America, so that trading companies, and even banks, had been founded in consequence of the contents of such messages, the result being that the mortals who so acted soon discovered that they had been wofully deceived. Through the mediumship of his own wife—who was better known to many present by the name of Kate Fox—he sometimes had wonderfully reliable messages, but he found that when she went to other séances the messages became unreliable, and continued to be untruthful for several days afterwards; the influences seemed to cling to her. The persons present at circles influenced the communications very much. . . . If pure communications were wanted, the medium must be purified and kept away from all worldly influences; until this was done, he believed that no reliable messages would be obtained, save under exceptional circumstances. This might seem a harsh judgment on his part, but it was brought home to his own mind by hard experience, and he believed that those who had most experience in the subject would give the same testimony.

The discussion which followed among these Spiritualists in conclave is extremely interesting. Nearly all who spoke were men whose names were prominently connected with the movement. One or two of them were themselves mediums, and all had had considerable personal experience in attempts to communicate with the departed. A Mr. Charles Hunt, with entertaining *naïveté*, remarked that "if others than Spiritualists had been present at that meeting they would have thought that all, from the chairman downwards, were a pretty lot of people," but Miss Kislingbury, a very energetic advocate of the cause, replied that this (*i.e.* frank discussion) "was one of the objects of the meeting. Only members were admitted; they were therefore not in the attitude of believers against disbelievers, and consequently interior questions connected with the movement could be discussed which could not with advantage be published to the outside world." Finally, Mr. Jencken, the chairman, in replying, protested "that he and others, who were largely experienced in the actual facts of Spiritualism, did not want utterly to overturn the faith of those who had less; they only contended that a

large proportion of the communications were unreliable, and that in one case at least home conditions had tended to make them more reliable."¹ Let me only remark, by the way, that if this was the experience of those who owing to their financial position and their prominence in the movement had the very best available mediums at their command, what was and is likely to be the fate of the common herd of inquirers who possess neither money nor influence and who have perforce to be content with such mediumistic assistance as is locally within reach?

Another cause of the collapse of the Spiritualistic movement was undoubtedly the strong prejudice created by the multitudinous exposures of mediumistic trickery which at this period were exceptionally numerous. Several passages bearing on the prevalence of imposture during the time of D. D. Home's mediumship were quoted in these pages a year or two back.² To repeat them here is unnecessary, but one or two fresh illustrations may be given. Home himself was one of the few physical mediums who was never convicted of fraudulent phenomena. He is honoured by Sir Arthur C. Doyle not only as a man of the highest principle but as one "of so sweet a nature and so charitable a disposition that the union of all qualities would seem almost to justify those who to Home's great embarrassment were prepared to place him on a pedestal above humanity."³ Nevertheless this god-like and charitable personage expressed the opinion that the Spiritualism of his day was honeycombed with every kind of imposture and moral obliquity. As early as 1865 Home, to the huge scandal and disgust of his fellow-Spiritualists, denounced the famous Davenport brothers as "unmitigated humbugs";⁴ and in 1877 he published his book "Lights and Shadows of Spiritualism," which from beginning to end is little more than an indictment of the gross trickery practised by contemporary mediums. Of course this outspoken volume was severely criticized by many journals devoted to the cause, but one of the leading Spiritualistic organs in the United States was candid enough to own that such plain-speaking

¹ *The Spiritualist*, Nov. 26, 1875, pp. 259-261.

² *THE MONTH*, July, 1926, pp. 8-10.

³ "The Vital Message," pp. 54-56.

⁴ See *The Spiritual Times*, 1865, July 1, p. 206, and July 15, p. 222. Sir A. C. Doyle apparently does not agree with Home's verdict. He is strenuous in his defence of the honesty of the Davenports.

was called for. In a long review *The Religio-Philosophical Journal* of Chicago remarks:

The true medium will thank Mr. Home for his urgent demand for light instead of darkness, and test conditions at every séance. But there is a large class of them, who play the confidence game with their gifts or live by foulest imposture, who will cry persecution . . . We are standing at the dawn of a new era in Spiritualism. The day of the wonder-worker, of credulity and rascality, is fast closing . . . The wandering medium, who insists on his own conditions, and those of fraud, who objects to anything having the least value as a test, will be discarded. The cause has been dragged down to the dust by these, and their gross impositions have made even the name of Spiritualism a reproach.¹

In January, 1876, Dr. G. Sexton, the editor of the (English) *Spiritual Magazine*, wrote:

The detection of mediums playing tricks is becoming so common that unless Spiritualists as a body take some steps to prevent it the movement will be simply ruined. It is no wonder that the public is sceptical of the whole thing when one after another of the recognised mediums is caught cheating.²

In the same journal a few months later we may read that "trickery in connection with Spiritualism is so rife that it threatens to swamp the entire movement," and this is followed by a letter from "one of the oldest and best-known Spiritualists"—it is so the editor describes him—"a man who has done noble service in the cause during the last twenty years and more." In this the writer observes:

Mrs. Hardinge-Britten says the cheating of mediums in the United States is most notorious and scandalous, and I must confess that when I look down the long column of advertisements in *The Medium and Daybreak* of all sorts of announcements of séances, cures, materializations etc., grave doubts of the *bona fides* of many of these pretences assail me. . . . In any case I am per-

¹ Quoted in *The Spiritual Magazine*, Aug. 1877, p. 364.

² *The Spiritual Magazine*, Feb. 1876, p. 71.

suaded that there is an enormous amount of trading on poor Spiritualism which if not looked to and exposed by Spiritualists themselves, will soon bring awful disgrace on the cause.¹

Let me emphasize the fact that the testimony I have quoted—and much to the same effect might be added—does not come from the assailants of the movement or from pulpit orators, but proceeds from those who were not only sympathisers but Spiritualists of long standing, men of recognized authority and wide experience. No wonder that confidence was forfeited and that a creedless public, craving for sensations of a certain quasi-religious flavour, turned their backs upon Spiritualism and paid court to Mme. Blavatsky, Mrs. Eddy, Moody and Sankey, and at a somewhat later date to John Alexander Dowie, "Pastor" Russell, Billy Sunday, and countless other charlatans. So far as the bulk of the population were concerned, the glorious era of illumination which spirit intercourse was to introduce before the end of the century was quite forgotten. Spiritualism indeed remained, but it took its place with half-a-dozen other competing cults and henceforth it could never again make any pretence of dominating the public eye.

One other cause which beyond question had much to do with the failure of Spiritualism as a movement was the acute contradiction in the theological outlook of some of its most energetic representatives. One has only to read the reports of the various Conferences which discussed the question of organization, to see that year after year every effort to frame some satisfactory "Declaration of Principles and Purposes" was invariably wrecked over the profound divergence in the religious views of those who took part in the discussions. Writing in September, 1873, the editor of the *Spiritual Magazine* points out that "hitherto all attempts at national organization, whether in America or England, have met little or no success, generally indeed leading to a more complete disorganization, by bringing out more conspicuously the wide and fundamental differences on important subjects which divide Spiritualists, and which vitally affect their conceptions of Spiritualism, and of the spirit and objects that should be aimed at in any movement for its more general diffusion."

¹ *The Spiritual Magazine*, Dec. 1876, p. 558.

In the beginning what we may call "Christian Spiritualism" was in the ascendant, and though the Christianity was of a very vague description, respect for the Bible and its teachings was generally inculcated. But soon a party arose which was avowedly opposed to the creeds and to any belief in revelation. Such doctrines as those of eternal punishment, the virgin-birth, the Incarnation and the atonement, were treated as degrading to man's intelligence, and many leading Spiritualists who belonged to the "progressive" faction grew impatient at the idea of making any compromise in the interests of peace.¹ In our own day the anti-Christian faction have almost everywhere gained the upper hand. Christ is indeed spoken of, but only as a sage or *guru*, like Buddha, Mahomet or Confucius, and some Spiritualistic journals, *e.g.*, *The Two Worlds*, seem to make it a formal part of their programme to run a tilt against religious dogmas of every kind and description.

Finally there was another element in the situation which was also of considerable importance, and it is that element which, coming again to the surface in some of the communications received in this country in quite recent years, affords perhaps the most serious reason for disquietude as to the future. From the very beginning of the movement people had been scandalized by the fact that a number of the most successful mediums were notoriously identified with a very low standard of moral conduct. When a critic in 1852

¹ The difficulty arose again and again, but a good idea of the situation may be obtained from the report in *The Spiritualist* of the 1875 Conference (see that journal for Dec. 3rd of the same year). For example, Mr. Herbert Noyes declared that "Spiritualism was destined to do away with the foundationless faith of the Church; he did not think it was right to be diplomatic in dealing with the subject, or to use words which concealed their real meaning; it was best to speak out, for sooner or later Spiritualism would have to fight with tremendous ecclesiastical prejudices." Dr. Sexton, on the other hand, himself a convert from materialism, considered that "the Christian Church had been in all ages the stronghold of the belief in the reality of a spirit world. . . . He had been told that Spiritualism was about to do all kinds of impossibilities; it was to overturn everything and to establish a new order of things upon earth, but as a matter of fact it was only the power of communicating with the spirit world; beyond that it gave very little knowledge at present. The teachings of spirits were as varied as those of men in the flesh." He went on to illustrate his point by referring to the question of Reincarnation, and he added that while "some spirits taught as true all the commonly received ethics of Christianity, others again taught the belief of Dr. Clark (there present) and of some persons in America, that there was no God." The same Dr. Sexton also remarked at a later stage that "he had friends who had become Roman Catholics in consequence of the spirit messages which they had received; those friends believed that the spirits who taught the doctrine were true and reliable in their utterances."

expressed his misgivings on the point in a letter to the (American) *Spiritual Telegraph*, the editor did not attempt to deny the allegation, but contented himself with saying that a man who wants to send a message does not consider the moral character of the bearer, but selects the instrument best qualified to convey his despatch to its destination.¹ In E. W. Capron's book "Modern Spiritualism, its Facts and Fanaticisms" (Boston, 1855), we already find reference to "a class of Spiritualists—or more properly speaking, a few individuals—who seek to make Spiritualism responsible for what is known as Free Love." Further he adds: "just now an attempt is being made to identify Spiritualism with this theory of religious libertinism, and many of the editors of the country are horrified at it."² Still Mr. Capron, though not wholly uncritical, was an ardent advocate of spirit intercourse. Notwithstanding his disclaimer, there can be little doubt that even then the trouble had struck deeper than he was willing to admit. The Rev. Adin Ballou, whose enthusiastic anticipations of the new era of enlightenment ushered in by the rappings were quoted last month, subsequently proclaimed in his Autobiography that he was compelled to withdraw from any connection with Spiritualism because of its moral laxity.³ Certain it is that when Mr. Algernon Joy, who was the Honorary Secretary of the British National Association of Spiritualists, paid a visit to the United States in 1875, he reported to the Association on his return:

Because of the doctrine of Free Love being so much mixed up with spiritualism, there are many spiritualists who never mention their belief, because they do not wish to be mixed up with the disputed question. I was introduced to one lady in San Francisco, and was afterwards shocked by discovering that she had had four husbands, one of whom cut his throat because she left him, and the other three are still living. . . . I was told that probably one-third of the acknowledged spiritualists in the

¹ See the Editor's laboured rejoinder in the *Spiritual Telegraph* for June 12 and June 19, 1852.

² Capron, "Modern Spiritualism," p. 380. Anyone who reads Mrs. Hardinge's 23rd chapter, on the "Kiantone Movement," will see that as early as 1854 Free Love doctrines were working infinite mischief among the Spiritualist ranks, "Modern American Spiritualism," pp. 229-239 and pp. 363-364.

³ I have not been able to secure a copy of Ballou's Autobiography, but I had this quite definite statement in writing from the late Prof. Henry Ford of Princeton University.

United States are Free Lovers, and that is a reason why many who are spiritualists in faith do not avow it. The other two-thirds of the spiritualists are perhaps the most violent opponents of Free Love that exist anywhere.¹

The same Mr. Algernon Joy, whose official position in connection with English Spiritualism authorizes us in believing him to be a trustworthy witness, had previously written a long letter from the States dealing with the Free Lovers (or as they styled themselves, the "Apostles of Social Freedom"), in the course of which he says:

It is monstrous that Free Love, which has not the remotest connection with Spiritualism, should play the cuckoo and shelter itself under our wing, thereby damaging our reputation; and I cannot understand the position assumed . . . by the editor of *The Banner of Light* and of the *Chicago Spiritualist at Work* [these were two of the most influential journals of the cult] when they say that they are bound to afford a free platform and therefore must admit Free Love articles and letters.²

On another occasion Mr. Joy also stated that "probably at least half of the *avowed* Spiritualists in San Francisco are Free Lovers" and he added, "I understood that there were no Free Lovers who were not avowed Spiritualists." Similarly we find him remarking that when in Boston "I heard Moses Hull preach there; his address was an admirable one, and although he is said to be a great Free Lover, he made no allusion to that subject; his remarks were an explanation of a few chapters of the New Testament containing some rather striking ideas in relation thereto." Mr. Moses Hull was, of course, a professed Spiritualist and the majority of his audience are stated to have been Free Lovers as well as Spiritualists.³

An English medium, J. J. Morse, visited America earlier in the same year, and speaks in similar terms:

I am sorry to say [he writes], but nevertheless it is true, that our brethren are sadly divided over here; the cause

¹ *The Spiritualist*, Dec. 10, 1875, p. 279. Mr. Joy also gives the names of two Spiritualist papers advocating Free Love, *Woodhull and Claflin's Weekly*, and another paper edited by Moses Hull. This was *Hull's New Monthly Clarion*.

² *The Spiritualist*, Sept. 17, 1875, p. 136.

³ See *The Spiritualist*, 1875, Dec. 10 and Dec. 17.

being the much-vexed question of Free Love, or, as it is called by the opposite side, "free lust." Public sentiment outside our ranks and the sentiments of all true souls within them, my own included, join in condemning this—to put it mildly—most peculiar doctrine. . . .¹

It was all very well for Mr. Burns, the editor of *The Medium*, to declare in his journal in October 22, 1875, that "the Free Love movement is dead in America," and that "Mrs. Woodhull's paper has abandoned the advocacy of Free Love doctrines months ago," adding satirical comments on the fact that "the filthy thing Free Love has all at once become a saint" and that now "Mrs. Woodhull's lugubrious harangues are plentifully interlarded with Scripture texts." But Mrs. Woodhull was still a highly popular person with her fellow Spiritualists, and the same Mr. Morse, whose words I have just quoted, wrote on March 20, 1875, in enthusiastic terms of "Mrs. Victoria C. Woodhull, the great champion of 'woman's rights' and 'social freedom.'" He visited her and she is described by him as "amiable and intelligent, with a certain womanly grace and most evident earnestness . . . she is an entertaining and intelligent speaker and draws large audiences to hear her."² Still more strange is the fact that *The Spiritual Magazine* in November, 1876,³ treated Mrs. Victoria Woodhull's repudiation of Free Love principles as an event of quite recent date. She has "at last discovered

¹ *The Spiritualist*, Jan. 8, 1875, p. 19.

² *The Spiritualist*, April 16, 1875, p. 190. It is impossible within reasonable limits to give any adequate idea of the shiftiness and insincerity which marked the attitude of many Spiritualists and in particular of some prominent mediums towards the Free Love movement. The same Mr. Morse, who professed to be shocked at these teachings, is definitely stated in the (*Boston*) *Banner of Light* to have "moved a Free Love resolution" at a Camp Meeting on Aug. 28th, 1875. When taxed with the fact, he simply evaded the challenge. See the whole discreditable correspondence in *The Medium and Daybreak*, beginning Oct. 15th, 1875, pp. 666, 680, 684, 701, 744. It was only then, when public attention had been directed to these scandals, that it occurred to Mr. Burns, the editor, to denounce Mrs. Woodhull, "the president of that contemptible bubble, 'the American National Society of Spiritualists,'" and to speak of "the filthy correspondence which used to exhibit the practical aspect of Free Love teachings in Mrs. Woodhull's *Weekly*." The worst feature in the case was that these immoral doctrines professed to emanate from archangelic spirits who communicated through the mediums. See Hardinge, "Modern American Spiritualism," pp. 232—233. I may note that in *The Sunday Express* for March 4, 1928, Sir A. C. Doyle speaks with marked respect of the trance addresses of Mr. J. J. Morse.

³ *The Spiritual Magazine*, Nov. 1876, p. 520. Only a few months before the same journal had commented in feeling terms upon "the Free Love abomination which has fixed itself like a parasite upon American Spiritualism." *Ib.* p. 81.

that these doctrines would be sure to be taken advantage of by persons whose only object in adopting them would be to furnish excuses for the gratification of their own depraved appetites." Be this as it may, the freedom of discussion tolerated in the most respectable of the American Spiritualistic organs must have been extraordinary. Mr. Joy commends the *Religio-Philosophical Journal* of Chicago, but it appears that even in that paper absolute licence prevailed. A writer contributed an article to it which attempted "to show the fallacy and nonsense of the Sermon on the Mount. He defined the Golden Rule as Free Love doctrine. He called the whole Sermon 'a batch of nonsense' and 'clear as mud'."¹

These were, I think, the causes which half a century ago discredited Spiritualism among the more upright and intelligent of the American people. The cult was not, of course, eradicated, but in the United States it has never recovered the ground then lost, it has never won general respect, it has never been recognized as an elevating influence. It is because the same unsavoury tendencies are making themselves manifest in English Spiritualism now, that I judge all the new prophecies of world change, of unfettered communication, of guidance from on high, to be a mere *ignis fatuus* of mocking spirits destined to fade into nothingness as ignominiously as the promises made long ago to the Fox sisters and their contemporaries. But of this I propose to speak more at large in another article.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ *Ib.* April, p. 180.

WORLD PROBLEMS OF POPULATION¹

SO many conferences are held at Geneva under the auspices of the League of Nations that a Geneva conference which has no official credentials may innocently deceive the public as to its character. The World Population Conference held in Geneva from August 29th to September 3rd last year was a private enterprise and the chief promoter was Mrs. Margaret Sanger, President of the American Birth Control League. The selection of speakers was in keeping with the Neo-Malthusian origin of the Conference and, as already stated in *THE MONTH* for October 1927, a number of those who attended were so convinced that it was a piece of American Neo-Malthusian propaganda that steps were taken to form another international organization, anti-Malthusian in attitude, for the study of the same problems. The League of National Life, which combats birth-control propaganda in England, had its observers at Mrs. Sanger's conference in Geneva, and they are giving their powerful support to the international antidote.

The present writer was not at the Conference and he can only judge it by the printed *Proceedings* which are now available. The Malthusian inspiration in the choice of speakers is evident enough, especially among the representatives of the United States and Great Britain, nevertheless the report as a whole contains very little that the birth controllers will be able to exploit as scientific sanction for their propaganda. Much was said at the Conference about its rigidly scientific character. There is a suggestion that those who have made up their minds about the intrinsic immorality of artificial birth control are *ipso facto* unscientific. It would be equally unscientific to approach population problems with a prejudice against abortion and infanticide.

The Malthusian mentality was perfectly exemplified by Professor H. P. Fairchild, Professor of Sociology, New York University. He began his paper with the statement that in "ordinary discussions of population" it is assumed that "a great many people are habitually having more children than they would wish to have, and that for some reasons or other

¹ For a fuller exposure of Malthusian economics the reader may be referred to Mr. Somerville's article in *THE MONTH* for September, 1927 (pp. 202 sqq.), of which the present discussion may be regarded as a sequel.

it is desirable that they should continue to do so." Professor Fairchild set himself to analyse the reasons for the old-fashioned antipathy to contraception. The first reason is militaristic, the second is dynastic, inasmuch as rulers regard the mass of the people as their possessions and want to increase their possessions, the third is sectarian because "there is no better guarantee for the spread of the faith than a generous production of offspring," the fourth is "a sort of ethnic egotism" and finally "there is sheer megalomania, an unreflective desire for bigness for its own sake." Not a word in this analysis of the moral objection to contraceptive practices, as if to the Professor of Sociology the moral objection were not so much irrational as non-existent.

The first paper read at the Conference was by Professor Raymond Pearl on "The Biology of Population Growth." Professor Pearl says it is an observed fact that the growth of populations of the most diverse organisms follows a regular and characteristic course: it begins slowly, it gains impetus, it develops great rapidity, then the rapidity declines gradually until finally there is no more perceptible growth at all. The claim is made by Professor Pearl that the fertility of organisms diminishes with the increase of density of population. His most interesting argument is based on experiments with the fly *Drosophila melanogaster*. We may accept on Professor Pearl's authority, the fact that the rate of reproduction of fruit-fly populations does diminish as the density increases, but we do not know by what biological method the correlation is achieved, and therefore we cannot guess whether it has any significance applied to human populations. For what they are worth, Professor Pearl's arguments tell against the necessity for deliberate family limitation, and Dr. Halliday Sutherland took the opportunity of saying in the discussion: "I accept the evidence of the experiments that density of population by itself will reduce fecundity, which must be most comforting to those who are haunted by the nightmare of an overpopulated earth."

Two professors who suffer from this nightmare rather dreadfully read papers at the second session. One was Professor Fairchild, already described, on "Optimum Population," and the other was Professor East, a geneticist of Harvard, whose subject was "Food and Population." Professor Fairchild essayed to show the relations between four factors, the size of population, the amount of land, the state of the arts

and the standard of living. Optimum population is that which achieves the maximum standard of living. The standard of living is not an ideal but an actual condition. "Furthermore, it appears that the content of the phrase should be restricted to material, tangible goods that are susceptible of observation and measurement, ignoring all those spiritual or intellectual enjoyments which, however important, have no material basis and therefore are not susceptible of exact treatment." Such naïve materialism would be astounding if it were not so common among a certain type of " scientist " who simplify their problems by leaving out the factors that make solution difficult. This Professor of Sociology who, dealing with a social fact like the standard of living, avowedly ignores " all those spiritual or intellectual enjoyments which, however important, have no material basis and therefore are not susceptible of exact treatment " affords an example of scientific ineptness that deserves to become classic. Love, justice, honour, patriotism, the things which most men regard as essential to make living worth while, are not counted in the standard of living, because the scientist cannot measure them as he can measure automobiles and fur coats.

Professor Fairchild says that underpopulation has been very rare in human history while overpopulation is very common. He thinks that the United States are already overpopulated or, if not, they very soon must be if the present rate of growth continues. The obvious comment was made by a Swedish Malthusian who observed that if the United States had got to the wrong side of the point of optimum the countries of Europe must be very much further wrong, for all of them wished to send emigrants across the Atlantic. To the honour of the United States be it said that an American, Dr. Warren Thompson, pointed out that the best standard of living meant other things besides the maximum consumption of material goods. " An optimum population in the purely economic sense might easily dictate that people should not have children under certain conditions ; but it is quite possible that an optimum population from the standpoint of the development of human character and of the broader spiritual values in human life might require that we should keep up the population beyond the point where it could be supported at the maximum standard of living about which Professor Fairchild speaks."

The chief point made by Professor East was : " The potential food supply of the seas, lakes and streams is relatively

unimportant. The effort of the human race to expand its numbers is limited to the produce of about thirteen thousand million acres of tillable soil, two-fifths of which is now under cultivation. And since it takes at least two-and-a-half acres to support each individual under the present standards of agricultural efficiency, it is clear that the world can sustain only five thousand million people, unless unforeseen radical discoveries in science bring about revolutionary changes in our economic system. At the current rate of growth, this number would be reached in about a hundred years."

Regarding possible supplies of fish, the views of Professor East are not in accord with those of the Imperial Economic Committee which recently reported on the fish supplies of the British Empire.¹ His estimate of the tillable area of the earth is very questionable. Every year land is being brought into cultivation that hitherto was thought unavailable. The Canadian Government, in a report last year, spoke of the breeding of new varieties of corn "materially increasing the area capable of agricultural development, so that the agricultural possibilities of the lands north of the 60th parallel are as yet practically unknown." If the Canadian Government does not know the agricultural possibilities of its own northern territories, we may be permitted some doubts about Professor East when he dogmatizes for the whole earth. When he says it takes the produce of two-and-a-half acres to maintain a single individual and calculates from this the possible population for the world he is guilty of a glaring fallacy. The estimate of two-and-a-half acres per person is made by a number of authorities but it refers to the maintenance of a person living on the standard of white peoples. It was pointed out in the discussion of Professor East's paper that in Java the people live on the produce of half an acre. Dietaries differ according to climates and the whole world need not reach the meat-eating standard of the Anglo-Saxons.

Professor J. Bourdon, of the Sorbonne, contributed a very short paper on the same subject as Professor East and came to very different conclusions. He said: "The increase of the world population has not yet excluded [exceeded?] the food supplies; it has not yet, in fact, overtaken them. Long periods will pass before the danger, spoken of as close at hand, will become a reality. The real problem for us to-day is that created by the unequal distribution of the population." The

¹ Cmd. 2934.

natural sequel was a discussion on migration which aroused more public interest than any other subject at the Conference for it was evidently the most practical. This was not pleasing to the Malthusian mentality. Professor East again came forward to show that emigration will not save the world from economic catastrophe and it will lead to biological disaster. "It seems to me that no statistician who has adequately and properly studied the facts can deny that, if emigration takes place from a country in which there is population pressure to a so-called underpopulated country, there is an immediate increase in the birth rate in the former country which restores the previous equilibrium. The same thing happens after war, pestilence and famine as well as emigration. Anyone who has studied the statistics of recent years will agree on that. Emigration, therefore, cannot be more than a very temporary solution of the population problem." Professor East does not deign to give instances though it would be very interesting to learn from him which countries have been increasing their birth rates as a result of emigration. Over a million emigrants (in excess of immigrants) left the United Kingdom in the decade 1901-11, but since 1901 the birth rate has fallen from 28 per 1,000 to 18 per 1,000. This kingdom has also had a war without experiencing the increase in the birth rate which Professor East cocksurely says must certainly have happened.

The biological disaster prognosticated is to arise because when a country where there is population-pressure sends out emigrants, those sent out are such as are not able to compete with their own fellows in their own land. Prof. East is careful to limit this assertion to the later 19th and early 20th centuries. Even so he levels the charge of eugenic inferiority against a very large element in the population of the United States and other new countries. There is no reason for thinking that the selection of emigrants works differently now from the way it has worked for a hundred years, and if Professor East is logical he must be extremely pessimistic about the biological quality of his fellow-countrymen. The proposition is really not worth discussing, but it shows how prone is the Malthusian mentality to doctrines of despair.

On the question of migration the Conference had the advantage of two very excellent addresses from M. Alfred Thomas, the Director of the International Labour Office. The restrictions on immigration adopted by the United States in its quota law are deeply resented by countries which need to

find an outlet for their surplus populations. The United States are not the only offender. All the "countries of immigration" are closing their doors, or opening them but narrowly. At his post in Geneva M. Thomas has reason to know how acutely the trouble is brewing. In all sorts of discussions there is deadlock and obstruction apparently on trivial matters, but those behind the scenes know that the friction is caused by the antagonism between the countries of emigration and the countries of immigration. The situation is so tense that the governments have decided not to talk about it. The problem is meticulously excluded from official discussion, which is the most eloquent admission of its dangers. M. Thomas has no favour for this policy of sitting on the safety valve as a method of averting an explosion. "What is the use of having international institutions when each time that a serious problem comes up the States draw back and refuse to discuss it?" he asked. M. Thomas boldly asks for a system of international control of migration. This is clean contrary to the claim of the United States, of Canada, of Australia, of South Africa and other countries that regulations about immigration are purely matters of domestic policy.

There were some interesting papers at the Conference on the differential fertility of various social classes. Professor Carr-Saunders brought out the well-known fact that in England there is a marked relation between high social status and low effective fertility. Effective fertility takes account not only of the birth rate but the survival rate. He showed at the same time that the relation between low social status and high effective fertility is not so marked. The evidence is very strong that differential fertility is largely due to deliberate family limitation. No attempt is made to estimate how much limitation is accomplished by contraception. One of the pieces of evidence brought forward by Professor Carr-Saunders is the comparative fertility of Catholics and others. The Catholic diocesan returns for 1924 record 67,567 baptisms and 20,398 marriages. The ratio of baptisms to marriages is 3.3 to 1. The ratio of births to marriages for the same period was 2.4 to 1. "This would seem to suggest that the Catholic birth rate is to the general birth rate as roughly 3.3 to 2.4."

Dr. David Heron, a British statistician, made the point that the Catholic population in England is not immune from the influences affecting the general birth rate. He did not commit himself to the view that the ratio of Catholic baptisms to mar-

riages is a safe guide to the ratio between the Catholic and the general birth rate, but taking the *Catholic Directory* figures for what they are worth with the Registrar-General's returns he finds that in the four years from 1922 to 1925 the ratio of Catholic baptisms to marriages was 3.49, 3.39, 3.31, 3.17. The ratio of general births to marriages in the same years was 2.60, 2.59, 2.46, 2.41.

A paper on Holland showed that in that country also the Catholic birth rate was comparatively high. The provinces which have maintained high birth rates are Noord-Brabant and Limburg, both chiefly Catholic. Yet even here the birth rate has fallen since 1910, in Noord-Brabant from 33.07 to 29.84 in 1926 and in Limburg from 33.54 to 29.26. The neighbouring Protestant province of Zeeland has gone down to a rate of 20.78.

Another paper dealt with the differential birth rate in Germany. The Catholic population is growing faster than the Protestant population, but "it is questionable whether this condition may be regarded as permanent or whether the difference is only one of time in an irrevocable development. For the number of children is falling even amongst the Catholics, namely, in the urban well-to-do strata of the population." From one source birth-rate figures for the whole of Germany are taken :—

	1891-1895	1913
Wholly Catholic marriages	... 5.2	4.7
,, Protestant ,,	... 4.2	2.9
,, Jewish ,,	... 3.3	2.2

Later figures are for Bavaria only :—

	1913	1920
Wholly Catholic marriages	... 4.0	2.0
,, Protestant ,,	... 3.0	1.6
,, Jewish ,,	... 1.8	1.0

I give these figures without criticism or comment because I am not equipped for their adequate analysis. There is one observation I should like to make in leading to a practical suggestion, though the suggestion is rather outside the scope of this article. From the standpoint of political economy it is easy to demolish Malthusian doctrine. But no man living in the world to-day can fail to realize that, when small families become the rule in any social class, the position of parents of large families in that class becomes exceedingly difficult and

for married Catholics to be faithful to the moral law when living in a non-Catholic society at the present day may often require extraordinary virtue. It may roughly be estimated that the Catholic birth rate in England is one-third higher than the general birth-rate, that is to say, the Catholic birth rate is about 24 per 1,000 of the Catholic population. In a dominantly Catholic society like that of the Province of Quebec the birth rate is 50 per cent. higher.

If Catholics could live in a Catholic atmosphere they would be preserved from the worst moral diseases of modern times. This brings me to the practical suggestion. No one can doubt that streams of emigrants must go out from the older countries to the new and among the emigrants there will be a proportion of Catholics. Experience shows that there is a large amount of leakage among Catholics who settle in strange surroundings when those surroundings are mainly non-Catholic. Experience also shows that where Catholics settle in Catholic neighbourhoods they develop a very healthy religious life. The French-Canadians are the most prominent example of this, but the Scots Catholics of Nova Scotia have an equally edifying history though on a smaller scale. The lesson to be learned is that when Catholics emigrate from Britain and Ireland to Canada or one of the other Dominions they should settle in Catholic districts, or, to put it more strongly, they should form Catholic communities. This is hardly practicable except for agricultural emigrants but the bulk of emigrants must be agricultural as the Dominions are not allowing any special facilities to town workers. We must face the fact that numbers of the industrial workers of Britain will never again be absorbed in British industry and they must adapt themselves to Dominion agriculture. During recent years Father Andrew MacDonell, O.S.B., has transplanted thousands of Catholic Hebrideans to Canada. He has been almost too successful from the point of view of the Hebridean parishes, whose flocks are severely depleted, but in Western Canada most vigorous colonies of Catholic farmers have been established, farmers owning their own land, subject to mortgage payments, and with every prospect of increasing and multiplying, like the French-Canadian Catholics who double their numbers by natural increase every thirty years despite the fact that religious vocations to a life of celibacy are exceedingly numerous among them. The present writer feels obliged to use this consideration of world population problems as an opportunity for calling attention to the

immense importance of the proper direction of Catholic emigration.

The promoters of the World Population Conference propose the formation of a Permanent International Union to study "the population problem." This problem is stated as follows: "The earth, and every geographical division of it, is strictly limited in size and in ability to support human populations. But these populations keep on growing, and in so doing they are creating social, economic and political situations which threaten to alter profoundly our present civilization, and perhaps ultimately to wreck it."

One cannot have much confidence in the scientific attitude of those who state the problem to be considered in such a question-begging form. It would seem that the Union depends too much on Mrs. Sanger, whose qualification is organizing capacity rather than a scientific mind. Scientific study of population will be heartily welcomed by those who insist that all social science must be ethical, but there is reason to be on our guard against birth control propaganda being put forward in the guise of science.

H. SOMERVILLE.

JOSEPHINE BUTLER

1828-1906

AMONG all the women of the Victorian era who made so valiant a fight for the emancipation of their sex none stands out with greater lustre than Mrs. Josephine Butler, the centenary of whose birth is being widely celebrated this spring. It was a hard task in the face of official opposition and conventional disapproval to agitate for a girl's right, equally with her brother, to higher education, to break down the barriers that shut women off from the universities and the medical schools, or to open the doors of military hospitals to women nurses; it was harder still to lay the foundations of women's claim to that jealously-guarded political monopoly of the male sex, but it was surely hardest of all to denounce from public platforms a moral evil, to espouse the cause of the utterly outcast, and to lead an agitation against the well-nigh unanimous opinion of the military and medical professions of that day. And this at a time when women had not yet won the right to speak on platforms at all, and when the special iniquity, which Mrs. Butler felt it her duty to denounce, was one to which conventional morality in England demanded that no public reference should ever be made. For a woman, even a married woman, to attempt to break through such a conspiracy of silence was to court, not only opposition, but abuse and calumny and the loss of personal friends. So bitter at one moment of the controversy did feeling grow, both in the press and in Parliament, that one member allowed himself to declare in debate that he considered Mrs. Butler and her friends worse than the unhappy women whose advocate she had constituted herself. It is for deliberately facing all this and carrying on her crusade with faith and enthusiasm for seventeen weary years, until the special legislation she combated was finally repealed by Parliament (1886), that she has been rightly acclaimed as the most heroic Englishwoman of her century.

We are all of us familiar with the wise words concerning fools who rush in where angels fear to tread, but there are occasions in life when it is the angels themselves who are mistaken for fools by their short-sighted and prejudiced

contemporaries. For surely it is one of the attributes of saintship to "rush in" where ordinary mortals have hesitated to intrude and to be triumphantly vindicated in the end. One is reminded of Joan of Arc and her apparently insane belief in her mission to save France, or of St. Clare, facing the fury of her family and the shocked displeasure of all the virtuous matrons of Assisi by flying secretly at night from her father's house in order to throw in her lot with a little group of mendicant friars, or again of Catherine of Siena, through the many amazing episodes of her career, and not least when she faced the startled gaze of her townsfolk by kneeling by the side of Nicholas di Toldo on a public scaffold in order to comfort the dying moments of the young knight who had been brought by her prayers and exhortations to repentance and peace of soul. Josephine Butler surely had kinship with all of these when she deliberately stepped out of the seclusion of a singularly happy home life with husband and sons in answer to what she believed to be a divine call on behalf of her outcast sisters. And it may be doubted whether the conventional judgments of the Catholic Middle Ages were ever cast in quite such rigid and narrow lines as those of Protestant Victorian England, where a woman's vocation was concerned.

Some of Mrs. Butler's heroic qualities came to her from her birth and parentage. Her father, John Grey of Dilston, was one of the Greys of Northumberland, that family which has given so many distinguished public men to England, and was himself a man of unusual strength of character and independence of judgment who afforded his daughters a far more robust and solid education than was customary in those days. Josephine's childhood, moreover, was passed on the wild and romantic borderland of Scotland where much riding and tramping the moors developed her naturally fearless character. Thus she grew up both beautiful and talented, and at the age of twenty-four she married George Butler, a son of the Head Master of Harrow, himself a distinguished school-master, an accomplished linguist and a man of wide culture and charm. Five years at Oxford, ten at Cheltenham, and the remainder at Liverpool where Mr. Butler was appointed Principal of Liverpool College, formed the setting of their married life.

From girlhood, taught by her father, Mrs. Butler had

been a passionate believer in human liberty, and she was an ardent supporter of parliamentary reform and of the then active anti-slavery movement. Early in her married life she also espoused warmly the cause of the higher education of women, of which Miss Emily Davies, Madame Bodichon and others were the pioneer spirits, while, wherever she was, she co-operated in various forms of philanthropic effort. But, unsuspected by most, she was filled with a restlessness of soul which could not be healed by the ordinary avocations of a full and pleasant life. Prolonged ill-health and the terrible tragedy of the death of her little daughter, who fell over the banisters from an upper landing almost at her mother's feet, turned her thoughts yet more to the sadder aspects of our social existence with which her visiting among the poor had first brought her in contact at Oxford. This long period of darkness and depression was partially lifted at Liverpool, where, in her own words, she was "possessed with an irresistible desire to go forth and find some pain keener than my own." Liverpool, unhappily, as both a port and an industrial centre, had more than its due share of poverty, misery and vice, and Mrs. Butler, with her husband's full consent, did not hesitate to take into her own home many a young girl whom she was anxious to rescue from a life of sin and degradation and nurse back to health and useful service. In course of time their number grew so great—her work, she writes, "drawing down upon my head an avalanche of miserable, but grateful womanhood"—that it became necessary to organize a Home of Rest for them.

This self-sacrificing work for others, which included much visiting of workhouse and casual wards, was, in Mrs. Butler's eyes, a school of learning for herself, and if at first it tended to deepen the perplexity of her mind before the difficult moral problems by which she found herself confronted, it brought out all the passionate love of fallen humanity of which her soul was capable. For her—and hers was a deeply religious nature—love of God translated itself spontaneously into love of her neighbour. "For me," she wrote later, "there is no such thing as a refuse of society. The most degraded, the most criminal of men and women, are yet our brethren, and of none of them do we dare to say that they are beyond redemption and incapable of a spiritual resurrection." Thus it came about

that when, after the passing of the Contagious Diseases Acts of 1866 and 1869 conferring, for the first time, dangerously wide powers upon the police where women of immoral life were concerned, and many responsible people felt that the time had come when a great national protest must be made against these evil tendencies in legislation—a protest in which it was emphatically the duty of women to co-operate—it seemed natural to look to Mrs. Butler as the one woman in England capable of leading such a venture. It was not in her nature to refuse such an appeal, though she has herself recorded the anguish of mind that she and her husband passed through before the final decision was arrived at. The whole absorbing story of the long constitutional struggle that ensued—in Parliament, on the platform, in the press—has recently been admirably re-told by one who is herself old enough to have followed with sympathy the momentous controversy, Dame Millicent Fawcett.¹ It is rather with the motives that inspired Mrs. Butler, and with some of the moral considerations involved, that we wish to deal in this article.

Certainly, in spite of what appears to us to-day as the almost inconceivable violence of language used in the press concerning Mrs. Butler, no one could correspond less than she with the conventional idea of the "shrieking sisterhood." And this not only because she was a woman of exceptional refinement and culture, with a melodious voice and a charm of manner that quickly captivated her audience, but because, as we have seen, her crusade was founded on something far more stable than a merely emotional pity for the unhappy victims of our social laws. In addition to the strong spiritual motive that underlay all she undertook, Mrs. Butler had what is comparatively rare in women: an intense sense of justice, and a vivid belief in the principles of liberty enshrined in the British Constitution as having their foundation in the teachings of Our Lord. And it was because the Acts of 1866 and 1869 appeared to her as the very negation of all those principles which her father had taught her to revere, that her indignation against them was so deep-rooted. "The legislation we opposed," she wrote later in her "Personal Reminiscences," "secured the enslavement of women and the increased immorality of men;

¹ "Josephine Butler, her Work and Principles and their Meaning for the XXth Century." The A.M.S.H., 14, Great Smith Street, S.W.1.

and history and experience alike teach us that these two results are never separated."

Thus the agitation for her, was not primarily, as has often been assumed, a simple woman's war against man's injustice. It was far wider than that. It was, in the first instance, as a free citizen of a free country, and only secondly as a woman, that she felt compelled to come forward in defence of the right. Evil legislation in her eyes was morally injurious to men and women alike. And if she opened the campaign with a "Ladies' Appeal and Protest," in the course of years she gathered round her "a great army of good and honourable men," who, identifying themselves with her protests, "soon became aware that they were fighting also for themselves, their own liberties and their own honour." And from the very first, in every industrial town where she addressed meetings, she had hundreds of working men and women on her side, who realized that she was defending the cause of their helpless daughters.

It was, again, her strong sense of justice that made her so staunch an upholder of equality for all—rich and poor, man and woman—before the law, and it followed, in her view, that in matters of sexual morality there could be but one and the same standard both for men and women. Her work on the streets of Liverpool had roused in her a deep and permanent indignation at the widely accepted social injustice by which the burden and punishment of a common sin was to be borne by the woman alone. And at a time when, in practice at least, a double standard of morality was widely accepted, even among Catholics, she did much to create a new and regenerated public conscience concerning these vital matters.

Her attitude towards moral problems was also in harmony with Catholic teaching on this further point that she emphatically disclaimed the view that any people, men or women, could be made virtuous by force or law alone. And if she denounced State regulation, inspired by purely hygienic considerations, as worse than useless, she was insistent on the need for raising the whole moral standard of the nation. This she felt could only be effected, first, by the moral training of the young, from the earliest years of childhood, in habits of purity and sentiments of justice, and secondly, by bringing some strong spiritual agency to bear on the adult population. She never ignored the economic

aspect of the problem where women are concerned, but declined to regard it as the determining feature of a situation she never ceased to judge from a Christian standpoint.

Mrs. Butler's great work was in no sense confined to the British Isles. Indeed it may be questioned whether her reputation and personal influence were not greater on the Continent than at home. Long before the battle was won in the House of Commons she made prolonged visits to France, Belgium, Switzerland and Italy, holding meetings, rousing public opinion and proclaiming her moral teaching. Her knowledge of foreign languages enabled her to carry her message far and wide, and her indomitable courage in the face of administrative difficulties far greater in most European countries than in England, excited widespread enthusiasm on her behalf. In Paris she was allowed to inspect the great women's prison of St. Lazare, and she even interviewed the head of the French *police des moeurs* himself, and expressed to him in forcible terms her detestation of the system which he represented. In every country she visited she raised up a little group of earnest people, both Catholic and Protestant, who in the course of time formed an international Federation of societies pledged to oppose all forms of State regulation and to work for the principles she held dear. One by one most countries in Europe have abolished or at least modified the State system then in vogue, while public opinion in all lands has undergone so profound a change that it is difficult for us to realize to-day all that Josephine Butler had to contend with.

It is worthy of note that on the eve of the celebration of Mrs. Butler's Centenary, the League of Nations Expert Committee on the Traffic in Women has published its long-awaited Report, thus silencing, one hopes for ever, the voices of those who have loudly asserted that such things did not, and could not, go on. Fifty years ago Mrs. Butler became convinced of the reality of the evil, but in the face of all the secret influences that were brought to bear, it was impossible for her to establish publicly what private information had conveyed to her. To-day her veracity, her integrity and her wide understanding of a very painful subject have received the fullest confirmation from an international body whose authority no one can dispute.

V. M. CRAWFORD.

MARY WARD'S GREAT ENTERPRISE

II.—PROGRESS AND OPPOSITION (1616-1622).

THE Papal document sent from Rome early in 1616¹ commanding Mary's sisterhood to the diocesan Bishop, seems to have had considerable effect on the fortunes of the Institute; for within the next five years it developed rapidly and found new friends and protectors. Encouraged now by the highest authority, Bishop Blaise of St. Omer made every effort to win further support for Mary and her companions. A few months after the receipt of Cardinal Lancellotti's letter, he announced in a pastoral,—doubtless to silence opposition,—that the Pope had desired him to undertake the chief care and protection of the Institute, that its members now enjoyed the same privileges and favours from the Apostolic See, as rising Religious Orders are wont to enjoy before their confirmation, and that whoever assisted them would do a work most pleasing to the Pope and the Sacred Congregation. He also recommended them very earnestly in a long letter to the papal nuncio,² describing and praising their zealous labours in England and their educational activities and penitential manner of life at St. Omer. The new Congregation would doubtless be of great utility for the whole Church; for England it was a vital necessity. In that country ladies frequently occupied a commanding position in noble families: for this and other causes, it was upon them, in the opinion of many well qualified to judge, that the preservation and furtherance of the Faith must depend; and the new Institute, through the influence exercised by its members upon these ladies by education, by conversation and by the example of their virtuous lives, would thus prove a valuable instrument for the maintenance and restoration of the Catholic Religion. At the Pope's request he had endeavoured to promote this excellent work: it would be still further advanced if the nuncio lent to it the support of his authority.—This letter probably gave Albergati his first acquaintance with

¹ Letter of Cardinal Lancellotti, President of the Congregation of the Council of Trent.—April 16, 1616: cf. *THE MONK*, February, 1928.

² Antonius Albergati, Bishop of Bisceglia. The letter is in the Vatican Library, Fondo Capponi, n. 47, ff. 76—78, and does not seem to have been used by the biographers of Mary Ward. The copy at Farm Street, is without date. It was certainly written after the receipt of Lancellotti's letter, and as Bishop Blaise died March 21, 1618, there is not left much room for choice of date.

the Institute, and seems to have had a good effect: certainly later the nuncio proved himself a good friend to Mary and aided her in establishing new houses, notably in Cologne and Trier.

New foundations had indeed become a necessity owing to the increase in the number of members that resulted from the temporary approval of the Holy See. The first was made at Liège, where some of the principal inhabitants, having become acquainted with Mary and her work, earnestly desired her to establish a house of the Institute. Bishop Blaise once more came to her aid and at her request sent a letter of strong recommendation to Ferdinand,¹ the prince-bishop of the city. "Were your Serenity dwelling in Liège," he wrote, "I should think this commendation unnecessary. For the modesty, gravity and religion of these virgins themselves, and chiefly of Mrs. Mary who presides over the rest, would commend them to your benignity without other testimony."² Ferdinand's approval was accordingly obtained and within the year (1617) the establishment was completed with house, church and school. It soon gained general appreciation and esteem, and scarcely more than a year later a second foundation,—a novitiate,—was made in the same city. The use of the Roman ritual to which Mary was accustomed, and the great care with which all ceremonies were performed in the church of the convent won favour for the Institute with both Bishop and clergy, who were greatly interested at that time in liturgical observances.³ Ferdinand himself showed his appreciation by frequently attending the services and saying Mass in the convent church; and so satisfied was he with the work of the "English Ladies" that he invited them to establish a house and school in his city of Cologne. With the support of the nuncio and generous financial assistance from the Archduchess Isabella, this was eventually effected in 1620, and was followed the next year by a similar foundation at Trier. This support by Ferdinand of a non-cloistered congregation,—he seems to have taken the place of chief protector and promoter after the death of Bishop Blaise,⁴—is all the more remarkable, as in the synod of Liège he had himself laid particular emphasis on the enforcement of papal enclosure in the convents of the diocese.⁵

¹ Brother of Maximilian I. of Bavaria. He was archbishop of Cologne and ruled in addition the sees of Liège, Munster, Hildesheim and Paderborn.

² The letter is dated February 2, 1617. Translation in Chambers I., p. 501.

³ The Roman breviary was introduced into the diocese of Liège in 1618. (*Histoire du Bréviaire*, Baumer—Biron II. 361).

⁴ M. Fridl, *Englische Tugend—Schul Mariae*. Augsburg, 1732, n. 148.

⁵ *Decreta Synodi... Leodiensis*, 1618. *Titulus VII.*, c. v.

Another influential patron was gained for the Institute, at this time, in the person of the venerable Domingo de Jesus Maria,¹ whose acquaintance Mary made in connection with the house at Trier. The saintly Carmelite came to esteem her greatly and whilst prophesying the trials in store for her, encouraged and strengthened her in her projects, and later in Rome afforded her valuable assistance.

In England, also, during these years there was considerable development in the work of the Institute. From several indications in contemporary documents, it appears that the members did not now confine their activities around the "*habitatio portatilis*," as Fridl calls it, in London, but went also into the country districts where they could carry on their labours without too great danger of molestation from the Protestant authorities. Of the general character of their work in England some idea may be gathered from the already cited letter of Bishop Blaise to Albergati.—They visit the priests in prison, he tells us, and give them all the assistance they can, by themselves or by their friends or by the alms collected for that purpose. With schismatics and heretics they prepare the way for the priest so that they are at least willing to give him a hearing. By this means many conversions have been effected. To cite but one instance eight persons were brought into the fold, through one sister thus making the approach of the priest possible; without her the Father would not have been able even to get into touch with them. Often, too, they are present at the death-bed of their relatives and in that hour effect what many labours and arguments were unable to bring about during the whole course of their life. By prudent persuasion they prevail with noble ladies to send their children to be educated as Catholics abroad, see to the payment of the dowries of their sisters in religion,—a difficult matter in time of persecution,—and procure fees and other means for the support of their pupils at St. Omer.

This general description can be supplemented from a document of a few years later. It is the account of the work in Suffolk of Sister Dorothea, written by herself at the command of her Superior.² The centre of her activity appears to have

¹ He was held in high veneration at Rome and indeed throughout Europe. He was the wonder-worker of his age. An account of his life is given in "Reforma de los Descalzos de Nuestra Señora del Carmen." Madrid, 1684, IV., p. 788 ff. In the index under his name is found the naive remark. "See from p. 788, in which there is no column without prodigies and miracles; for we must not make a new book out of the index."

² Printed in Chambers, II., pp. 27—39. It is a valuable document of penal times.

been the house of a poor woman to whom she pretended to be related; though from time to time she stayed also at the house of Mrs. or Lady Timperley,—a friend of the Institute, to whom alone her identity was known.

I dare not keep schools publicly [she writes] as we do beyond the seas . . . but I teach or instruct children in the houses of their parents, which I find to be a good way, and by that occasion I get acquaintance and so gaining first the affections of the parents, after with more facility their souls are won to God. Besides teaching children I endeavour to instruct the simple and vulgar sort; I teach them their Pater, Ave, Creed, Commandments, etc. Those who, in respect of the fear of persecution, loss of goods and the like, I cannot at first bring to resolve to be living members of the Catholic Church, I endeavour at least so to dispose them that understanding and believing the way to salvation, they seldom or unwillingly go to heretical churches, abhor the receiving of their profane Communion, leave to offend God in any great matter or more seldom to sin, and by little and little I endeavour to root out the custom of swearing, drinking, etc. I tend and serve poor people in their sickness, I make salves to cure their sores and endeavour to make peace between those at variance. In these works of charity I spend my time, not in one place but in many places, where I see there is best means of honouring God.

She then goes on to lament how difficult it is to get a priest, when her would-be converts are ready to be reconciled. "I had at once three in great distress, for the space of a year I could by no means get one (a priest) although I walked many a mile to procure, neither could my lady help me." At length on March 20th she met a Benedictine, Father Palmer, who on being told of the three

had compassion on them and willed me to bring one of them into a by-field and there he reconciled her. The other two enforced to expect longer in respect of the inconveniency of the place. It was now Easter time and one of them being in danger of death, and remembering your reverence had willed me in such a case to spare no pains and to take what priest soever, I went twelve miles (which was little in respect of other journeys with me). There I found a secular priest and brought him home. This priest reconciled at this time

three And not long after, having three more to be reconciled in the same place, besides divers Catholics who from places far distant I had gathered together to receive the sacraments, by my lady her means, I procured a Benedictine, a very good and zealous man, and from whom the poor received much comfort, to come to the poor house where under pretence of gathering herbs to make salves with I had called them together some days before.

On April 19th she went to live for three weeks with a recent convert—a gentlewoman whose “ mother and father were such Catholics as take the oath, and the husband a very cold one. The whole house was very disorderly and had not good report. At my first arrival there I perceived it would not have been well taken if I had spoken of God, etc., wherefore sorting myself with their disposition I soon gained their affections, by serving and tending them both and making medicines and salves, and teaching them to do the same. In fine I so gained them that whatsoever I did or said was gratefully taken, then I endeavoured to lose no time for as much as I perceived the gentleman his life would not be long. I persuaded him to prepare himself by means of the sacraments for the next life.” As she had to depart she commended to him the “ Fathers of the Society ” as only such priests resorted there who held the oath to be lawful. The gentleman died just before she returned, having previously been reconciled by a Jesuit. “ The gentlewoman, now a widow, was earnest for my stay and I perceiving much good there to be done, in particular aiming at the conversion of four there, I was content to stay and entreated the Father to do the like. He staid and presently reconciled one and the others not long after.”

Meanwhile she had reformed the household. “ I had indeed instructed them, taught them the catechism, how to pray, provoked them to frequent the sacraments, to leave the customs of drinking and swearing, etc. I got the locks mended, carried off the keys every night and to give greater content there was no servile work about the house which I did not perform with all willingness.” The result was not merely the reformation of one house, but the establishment of a centre of the Faith—“ There came my lady (Timperley), Mr. Palmer, the Benedictine, and a great company besides and they found a neat chapel which pleased them all well.” A few months later on her return from a journey to London,

she visited her poor.' " Finding they had never any help for their souls but by me, I travelled eight miles to get a priest for them and for a gentlewoman who had not received any sacraments in six or eight years by reason she had married an heretic who used her ill. This gentlewoman, at my request, had begged a piece of land of her husband from a friend of mine, to build a house which I intend for the comfort of the poor to have a chapel and a chamber for the priest."

So the narrative continues, detailing conversions among both rich and poor; and these the fruit of one sister's activity in the space of little more than a year (1621-1622). Nor is there reason for thinking it exceptional. When the Benedictine, Father Palmer, not knowing Sister Dorothea to be a member of the new Institute, highly praised her work but spoke slightlyingly of Mary Ward and her Company, Mrs. Timperley called him roundly to task. " You condemn those whom you know not; for believe me, I know Mrs. Ward and others of hers as you know her here present, and could say as much of their progress in other places as well in poor as rich families, as her you daily see before your eyes, and if I should tell you what I know concerning them, how many and great personages converted by them, other reformations and the like done by them, you would, I doubt not, approve in them the same, and far greater in quality and number than these you see and are so pleased with; therefore condemn not those whom I dare say you know not. For besides what I know myself of them, I have heard divers learned, grave and virtuous men, and such as had best reason to know them, say that without question the spirit of God is with them and in great measure; otherwise it were impossible for them to have in all kinds and places performed so much good for God, His honour, as they have done in every place where they have lived and in such sort performed, as I have heard persons of good judgment avouch hath been rare."²

Yet at the very time such splendid work for souls was being done by Mary Ward and her companions, Catholic opposition to her was becoming more insistent and clamorous. The highest Catholic ecclesiastical authority then in England—the Archpriest Harrison—drew up a document extremely adverse to the Institute—which has been characterized by Guilday³ as from beginning to end a mass of lies and of truths

¹ One of the calumnies against Mary Ward and her companions was that they were concerned only with the rich and paid no attention to the poor: cf. Fridl, *op. cit.*, nn. 674 ff.

² Sister Dorothea's narrative: Chambers, II., 37.

³ Guilday, "English Catholic Refugees," p. 183.

twisted into calumnies. Yet it was subscribed after Harrison's death in May 1621, by ten of his assistants and forwarded to Rome. The particular charges it brought against the members of the Institute will call for discussion later, here it will be sufficient to note the general charge that they are "a great shame and disgrace to the Catholic religion, bringing it into ridicule with heretics as if it could not be supported or propagated otherwise than by idle and garrulous women."¹ If the heretics spoke derisively of them,—and they may well have caught the habit from the Catholic opponents of the "sisters,"—they certainly did not condemn the effect of their labours. Bishop Blaise testifies to the contrary that the Protestants were greatly concerned about it;² and indeed the facts speak for themselves. The result of Sister Dorothea's work in a certain town so enraged the non-Catholic neighbours and officers that they haled her before a justice. "I have been informed," he said, "and much urged to proceed against you; they say you live purposely with that gentlewoman to keep her a Papist: that in this short time you have been there, you have persuaded many from the King his religion, and if you continue and proceed as you have begun, the minister fears he shall lose all his sheep." Thanks, however, to the intercession of a relative of the justice, he let her off with a caution not to impart her faith to others: which she promptly disregarded, going presently to a sick woman in the neighbourhood and persuading her to become a Catholic. Susannah Rookwood, the Superior in England till 1621, was less fortunate: she was imprisoned for the faith no less than five times.³ And Mary Ward herself, who made at least two journeys to England during these years, and stayed some considerable time, wrought so much good for the Catholic cause, that special efforts were made by the persecuting Archbishop of Canterbury and his pursuivants to procure her arrest.⁴ "That woman," he declared, "does more harm to the English Church than many priests. Gladly would I exchange six or seven Jesuits for her."⁵ Eventually she was taken, at a port, brought back to London, thrown into prison and then con-

¹ *Copia Informationis de Jesuitiss ad Apostolicam Sedem factae per Rev. D. Gul. Harrisonum, Archipresbyterum nuper defunctum et ab Assistantibus post ejus mortem subscriptae.* West. Arch., xvi, pp. 201 ff. Part Translation, Chambers, II., pp. 183 ff.

² Letter to the nuncio Albergati.

³ Chambers, I., 338, citing old French necrology of the Institute.

⁴ Winifred Wigmore, cited by Chambers, I., 407.

⁵ D. Biselius, "Historia Vitae Rerumque gestarum Illustrissimae Virginis Mariae Ward." Augsburg, 1674, p. 66 [West. Archiv.].

demned to death. But martyrdom of that kind, much as she desired it, was not to be hers. She was spared and released, owing probably to the intercession of high-placed friends supported by the influence of the Spanish Ambassador and by that powerful solvent—gold.

With such evidence of the zealous and successful work of Mary and her companions and of the serious attention paid to it by the Protestant authorities, the question naturally raises itself :—how could Catholics, and priests too, oppose them so violently and write of them so erroneously as they did? The answer is :—through prejudice. Nothing so blinds the intellect to evidence as prejudice, nothing renders it so ready to accept as truth distortions of fact. And there was prejudice in plenty against the new Institute, arising from many causes and having precisely these two effects :—intellectual blindness on the one hand and utter credulity on the other. Its very novelty aroused suspicion. We who to-day are so accustomed to see the fruitful work of the active sisterhoods in our midst, and to hear of their zealous labours in far-off missionary lands, must think ourselves back into the beginning of the seventeenth century in order to realize how strong the suspicion of the Institute must have been in many of its contemporaries. Reform of convents had not long since been a crying necessity of the Counter-Reformation,¹ and it had been agreed that one effectual remedy for abuses was the enforcement of papal enclosure.² The uncloistered character of the new Congregation and particularly of its work in England, ran directly counter to this. Would it not, then, be simply re-opening the way to the old abuses? There were, also, special dangers in England,—dangers to faith as well as to morals. Priests even had succumbed to them. Was it wise then to expose the weaker sex to such perils; above all to allow religious women to establish themselves practically as solitary units, only rarely aided by the spiritual support that life in community affords? To many the experiment might well seem hazardous. Mary Ward herself recognized that very high and solid virtue was demanded of such sisters as were to be sent into England.³ And even among the Jesuits, who ever since their origin had themselves experienced the opposition of Catholics, which their new departure in the religious life entailed, and who on that account, one might think, would have shown sympathy for the new Institute,

¹ Cf. P. Tacchi Venturi, S.J., "Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia," Vol. I., c. vii.

² Cf. Pastor, *Geschichte der Päpste*, 81.4, pp. 193—5.

³ Chambers, I., pp. 329 ff, citing one of Mary Ward's conferences.

though some favoured, many looked askance at it; and the official attitude of the Society as a body was one of prudent, cold reserve, neither of approval, nor of condemnation. There was, it is true, in this case additional reason for caution; the Institute had taken the Jesuit rule; if disgrace were to befall it, and scandals to arise, the good name of the Jesuits would inevitably suffer¹ and occasion be given for further attacks from their many critics. The supposed connection, moreover, between the Institute and the Society had already given rise to calumnious reports² and had become an additional cause of friction in England between the Jesuits and the representatives of the secular clergy.³

Side by side, however with these intelligible grounds of prejudice against Mary and her companions, there were others less worthy. The older English convents on the continent and their supporters appear to have considered the Institute, somewhat as a rival and as a hindrance to their growth and prosperity. The earliest remonstrance⁴ against the "English Virgins" makes this the chief point of complaint, and further, charges them with endeavouring to induce all young ladies coming over from England to remain with them,—an accusation which is reiterated in practically all the papers hostile to the Institute. Already in 1615 Bishop Blaise had refuted it in a public letter in defence of the congregation. "After strict enquiry," he writes, "we find this charge to be wholly contrary to fact, for since the year 1610 in which they commenced, no less than forty-nine ladies have taken St. Omer on their way to other religious communities . . . not to mention three others who but yesterday started for Gravelines." He then gives a list of the convents into which the forty-nine have entered and adds. "How guiltless they (the "English Ladies") are of intercepting by their persuasions any who intend to go elsewhere, will appear from a document appended to this letter."⁵ "Far from being a hindrance, the new congregation will serve as a never-failing nursery to the convents of the same nation in Belgium, and those who are so concerned

¹ This is mentioned, as a cause for suppressing the Institute, in the Instructions sent to the nuncios in Germany and Flanders, July, 1628. Cf. J. Grisar, S.J., in *Slimmen der Zeit*, April, 1927, p. 51.

² Father Blount, S.J., in a letter (Circa, 1624) giving Father General's instructions concerning the Institute, writes, "whereby I hope in a short tyme the manifold calumnios wch for their cause and proceedings are layed upon us will have an end." Foley, Records I.

³ In the Instructions to the nuncios, July, 1628. This also is mentioned as a cause for the suppression of the Institute, cf. Grisar, *i.c.*

⁴ "On certain English Virgins residing at St. Omer," 1612.

⁵ Cited by Chambers, I., p. 324. The appended document is unfortunately not now extant.

for the said convents, will do them better service, by striving to foster concord between them and this godly Institute and by binding them together in the closest bonds of mutual charity, than by disturbing the peace of others and burthening their own consciences."¹

Priests, too, appear to have regarded the activity of the "English Ladies" with a certain professional jealousy, as though it were an injury to them, an invasion of their rights,² —a feeling which probably played its part in the charges brought against the sisters, of usurping functions peculiar to the priestly office,—charges never proved and roundly protested against by Mary herself³ and of which the real ground was the very novelty of their work.

Far more powerful, however, than any of the foregoing factors in stirring up prejudice against the Institute was its adoption of the Jesuit rule. Owing to a variety of causes, relations unfortunately had at that period become somewhat strained between the Jesuits and a considerable number of the English clergy, including many of its most eminent members. The opinion was current, however unfounded, that the Jesuits desired to have a dominating influence over English Catholic affairs, detrimental to that position of authority and trust which the secular clergy were entitled to occupy among Catholics in England. In this atmosphere of suspicion and distrust, it was not altogether surprising that the new Congregation, founded as it was on the Jesuit rule, fostered in its origin by a Jesuit and encouraged by others of the same order in England, should have been regarded as but another means for increasing the influence of the Society, already considered excessive.⁴ This hostility of the English clergy proved fatal to the Institute: it tended to make the Jesuit superiors regard it with increased reserve so as to avoid all possible occasion of offence; and was in itself one of the chief causes that brought about its eventual, though temporary, suppression.⁵

(*To be continued.*)

LEO HICKS.

¹ Cited by Chambers, *ibid.* p. 322.

² Biselius, *op. cit.*, pp. 65—66: Fridl, *op. cit.*, nn. 674 ff.

³ In her Memorial to Cardinal Borghese, February 29, 1625.

⁴ Cardinal Pallotto, nuncio extraordinary at the Imperial court, in a letter to Cardinal Barberini, August 5, 1628, speaks of the decision taken in Propaganda against the Institute "per quello che si vede da alcuni non solo approvato, mà fomentato e promesso da padri gesuiti, come istitruo potissimo per il loro accrescimento e potere . . . Archiv. Vatic., Nunzi di Germ., 116, fol. 73—74, in Kiewning." Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, I., p. 165. Cp. The charge was brought against the sisters of depreciating the secular clergy and extolling the Jesuits—in Harrison's report, Kellison's report, etc., etc. The original source of it was probably the ex-nun Allcock.

⁵ Chambers, II., xi. Guilday, *op. cit.*, p. 183: Fridl, *op. cit.*, nn. 676.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC AND HIS CRITICS

THE MONTH has already remarked a disposition in the Yankee mentality to suffer critics gladly, be they European or domestic. Whether this trait is to be translated as crass indifference, or humility with a hook, or the desire of the small boy to show his toys to the company, may be left for discussion to the psychologists or the novel-writers who specialize in such lore. The consoling fact remains that our noise and our superlatives are attracting serious attention in quarters where attention is flattering. At least Sammy is old enough and important enough now to be considered a problem, even though he be a menacing one.

Now the American Catholic is proud enough to think that he bears a certain necessary relation to the American problem,—or the American menace, as you choose. History and the Faith seem to agree with him that he has a mission in the New World comparable to that which Mr. Belloc established for the Church in Europe. We, too, use such terms as "gospel ferment," "primacy of the spiritual," and "our world for the Heart of Christ." And we submit that even the bare circumstance of the existence of some twenty million Catholics in the States is evidence that we have got along *some* distance towards the ideal.

It is therefore with a disappointment akin to pique that one remarks the almost total absence of any serious consideration accorded to the American Catholic programme by our latter-day critics, whose work has otherwise merited high praise. The complaint must not be made universal, of course; excellent observation work since the end of the last century has been done by Paul Bourget,¹ Ferdinand Brunetière,² Abbé Klein,³ Father Bernard Vaughan, and the genial Eucharistic Congress commentators, Monseigneur Grente of Le Mans,⁴ Henri Davignon of Brussels,⁵ and the Editor of THE MONTH in his excellent series published in the fall of '26. But, honest critics and sympathetic friends though all these were, and keenly conscious of the existence of the Church, *their* Church,

¹ "Outre Mer," 2 vols.

² "Le Catholicisme aux Etats-Unis."

³ "Au Pays de la Vie Intense."

⁴ "Le Beau Voyage des Cardinaux Français aux Etats-Unis."

⁵ "Heures Américaines."

as a fact and a force in the States, their limitation obviously lay in the fact that they were *pèlerins passagers* : they all had to hurry home with their diaries.

The same excuse doubtless will serve for Mr. Chesterton's omission of a grand climax-chapter on "The Oldness of the New, or America at Canossa" for his "What I Saw in America." That would have made reading every bit as interesting as the delightful political and economic sidelights that form the record of his all too short stay with us.

But it is difficult to say what allowance can be made for the shabby treatment accorded the Catholic Church in America by the in all other respects competent analyses of André Siegfried¹ and André Tardieu,² both of whom brought to their work a long and intimate association with the American *chez lui*. Perhaps, as Mayor Thompson might suggest, their documentation was exclusively Nordic ; but even that detail could not, seemingly, account for the thoroughly false assumption of both books that our American civilization and culture are simply and solely Anglo-Saxon and Protestant—even President Coolidge's first name is regarded as deeply significant in certain French circles!—and that any ideal or influence at variance with the Anglo-Saxon Calvinistic concept is thereby un-American. The best that Monsieur Tardieu could bring himself to say of our Roman Catholic tradition, from Archbishop Carroll to the Eucharistic Congress, was the enormity that

a day came when a Catholic, as Brownson, in preaching Americanism, adapted to this new tendency the rigidity of the Roman Church.³

I have not read Mr. Christopher Hollis' book,⁴ but some who have tell me that it needs more than one excuse, especially the thesis which on Catholic principles attacks the Constitution of the United States because its basis is not revealed religion. We are quite happy, thank you, to have an instrument of government which contradicts no truth of our Faith, and gives us all equality before the law. If memory serves me, G.K.C. is sponsor for a statement somewhat to the effect that the Declaration of Independence, *as far as it goes*, is a most papistical document. We are sure that Mr. Hollis would grant us that American Catholics, even solidly behind their Constitution, are at least travelling in the right direction.

¹ "Les Etats-Unis d'Aujourd'hui."

² "Devant l'Obstacle : 'Amérique et Nous.'

³ Op. cit., p. 45.

⁴ "The American Heresy."

All this might be said to be à propos of the stimulating article on "Catholic Culture in the United States," contributed to the March MONTH by Mr. Walter Gavigan. We hope our foreign interpreters, invited or uninvited, with or without condescension, will be inspired by it to further *vues d'ensemble* of the Catholic motif in the American drama, in the interest of an accurate and adequate picture of their Western cousins, and for Catholics especially, because of the splendid apologetic argument that we believe may be gained therefrom.

The article in question suggests, however, certain precisions and supplementary notes which I trust the author will pardon my subjoining here. Doubtless he would have added them himself, in substance, had space permitted.

There is first to be remarked the danger in any comprehensive view of the progress of Catholic culture in America, of identifying the forward movement with the effort of any single national group. The Melting-Pot has received its meed of the Church's glories from every corner of Europe, and that from the very beginning of the colonial concentration among us of Spaniards, French and English of the grand-siècle.

I am sure that Mr. Gavigan would not wish to leave the impression that a group of converts from Ritual Anglicanism in the nineteenth century originated, or gave the *chief* impetus to, "interest in the deep spiritual traditions and cultural resources of the Catholic Church." Yet a superficial reader might carry away that impression. Proud as we are of our little Oxford Movement, and of the signal service rendered to the Church by the former Transcendentals of New England, Union, Hobart and Kenyon, we must not forget that they did not become a part of "the Catholic tradition" themselves until the Church in the States was quite firmly established, and had acquired a cultural prestige compounded of many continental elements, as well as Merrie England's ever-precious contribution. For an instance, when Father J. Havens Richards, S.J. became President of Georgetown, that venerable University was almost a century old, and its graduates in public, professional and ecclesiastical life were the leaders of Catholic thought and action in the country. McMaster with his *Freeman's Journal* did indeed write a glorious chapter for Catholic journalism; but the numberless editions of "The Faith of Our Fathers" were broadcasting "the convincing claims of the Holy See" to a far wider audience, and with phenomenal success. Finally, in the transmission

to the New World of that sublime cultural glory of the mediæval Church, the Scholastic synthesis in philosophy and theology, the very heart of the Catholic school, the Ritualists had hardly any part at all. There was a goodly sprinkling of Latin names on all our seminary—and college—faculties from the first.

This is not to gainsay a whit of the praise that belongs to Brownson, Lyman, Everett, Whicher and our beloved Paulists. It is only to plead for the rest of the story, when one speaks of Catholic culture in the United States, the "Golden Day of the Church in America," etc. I am inclined to think that if there be a logical *suite* to the Catholic history of our four centuries, it leads up to, and away from, the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and has no very important connection with the conversion of Orestes Brownson.

Again, there is liable to linger some little confusion on the substance and significance of "Catholic culture" as used by our author and others. We are wont to say that a peasant whose life is moulded and guided by the truths of Faith is, whatever his lack of table-manners or of acquaintance with literature or the arts, more essentially cultured than a University professor whose horizon is bounded by this world and whose moral standard is evolved from a prudent self-regard. Of course, there is the reaction of the Faith to the achievements of natural genius, and when both are at work in one personality the result will be a culture which is Catholic. But the Faith is the main thing, not the human skill and taste with which it is associated. It is thus, we assume, that the remark that special attention was devoted by Fr. Hecker, in the last half of the nineteenth century, to "converts with literary backgrounds and reputations" is to be understood. It surely is not meant to convey the notion that the main factor in spreading the *ethos* of Catholicism has been our very small so-called leisure-class, with more or less direct Old World traditions and loyalties, rather than a heroic apostolic hierarchy, accepting and adapting to the Faith what it found in the New?

Obviously, much depends upon what the critic is looking for when he investigates Catholic culture in the States. If he expects to find continuity with definite European currents, he is doomed to disappointment in varying degree, according as his own background is English, French, Italian, etc. That is simply to say that he finds himself in America; and we must respectfully insist that the American milieu—which Paul

Bourget has called "a two-thirds successful experiment with the ideas of democracy, of science and of race"—is constantly conditioning the development of the Church's common cultural heritage, as milieus have the habit of doing everywhere. This seemingly banal and elementary truth is strangely liable to be forgotten by even the most distinguished and well-intentioned of observers. To leave Mr. Gavigan for the moment, witness this comment of Theodore Maynard upon George Shuster's recent work, "The Catholic Spirit in America." It is culled from the *Saturday Review of Literature* for February 11th:—

The phrase "Catholic Culture" is likely to strike the vast majority of Protestant Americans as odd. And it is perfectly true that what is generally recognized as culture, is not, as a rule, conspicuous in such members of the Church as the average American meets. He thinks of it with some excuse in terms of "wops" and "harps"—firemen, policemen, bootleggers and ward-politicians; for, unless he is very intelligent, highly educated, and widely travelled, he has no means of escaping from his own provincialism. . .

(The Americans) still lamentably lag behind their co-religionists in other countries. In England, for example, there are less than two million Catholics: in America there are twenty millions. But in England, despite the terrific handicap of an established Protestant Church, Catholics maintain themselves, without any apology, in every sphere of intellectual and social life. . . How is it then that American Catholics effect, by comparison, so little? My explanation, given after ten years spent in various parts of the United States, is that they suffer—almost as much as do the Jews—from an inferiority complex.

There is some truth, I suppose, in every clause of this indictment, launched by an Englishman "after ten years spent in various parts of the United States," though many Europeans I know would share my broad smile over the last sentence I have quoted. But before truth degenerate into reproach, what, in the name of all that is logical, are we expected to be, but a nation hardly out of swaddling-clothes, which the Spouse of Christ is trying to wean from a mighty material world that threatens to poison it?

The Catholic American is very much an American, and

the Church has her hands quite full just now with that first of Catholic "cultural" problems, keeping her children out of mortal sin. I really don't see how she could have arranged, in the short time she has had to work, "a cathedral created under the intense inspiration of mediæval Catholic genius" for their eyes to rest upon, as William Cobbett's did. But Mr. Maynard will remember that many a Protestant looked at the altar raised over Soldier's Field for the Eucharistic Congress, and more than agreed with Cobbett that "the men who built *that* were not benighted."

There is nothing alarming, or calculated to cover us with confusion, in the stricture on our provincialism. Some little experience and travel in Europe have brought home to most of us, I think, that there is no escape from provincialism *anywhere* except for the "very intelligent, the highly educated and the widely travelled." As for the opinion of the vast majority of Protestant Americans on the subject of Catholic culture, or even on culture in general, it is not clear just why that should matter very much. Their own standards, if we may judge by their representatives and the verdict of their foreign critics, leave much to be desired. But, beginning from the Church's cultural standard, I wager that Mr. Gavigan and Mr. Maynard could, if they tried, make out a case for Catholic education just reeking with superlatives; and surely the evocation at hazard of such names as Gibbons, Spalding, White, Laplace, Pallen, Egan and the Walshes would serve to show that in America, too, there have been, and are, Catholics to "maintain themselves, without any apology, in every sphere of intellectual and social life." The history of the Oregon school case was ample evidence, if any were needed, of their signal influence upon the destinies of the nation they are trying to bring to Christ.

The reference to the "wops" and "harps"—to view it without passion—echoes an expression used of the ingredients of our melting-pot by a recent French film: *déchets hétéroclites*—Europe's miscellaneous offscourings, I suppose that would be turned in English. So be it. Few of us have any illusions about our pedigree. These are our jewels. The Church has never blushed to call them her own. But to speak in terms of *essential* Catholic culture, we have most of them clustered about the altar of God, close to the Fountains of the Saviour. It is not to be expected at this late date that the Protestant mentality, especially of the aristocratic stratum, should remark any cultural significance in a crowded Novena

of Grace, a policemen's Sodality, or a pack of gamins singing out their catechism. The Protestant mentality is proverbially hazy in this, as in other matters. But is it too much to demand a clearer vision of gifted Catholics?

Culture, as narrowly expressed in terms of the fine arts, demands a certain modicum of national leisure. It is natural, therefore, that the American output in literature, architecture and music, speaking generally, should leave the European cold, and even contemptuous. "The vast majority of American Protestants" may here strike their breasts, as well as we ourselves. We have hardly established our frontiers; we are still busy clearing our wildernesses; still, as the French like to call us, "*une nation incapable de repos.*" André Siegfried, in the *Atlantic Monthly* for March,¹ says he found an entirely new nation when he visited us in 1925 after a few years' absence. Isn't there something a bit unfair about demanding the exquisite from a youngster hardly come of age? Likewise the Catholic Church in America may say to Old Europe, to whom she owes so much, "have patience, and I will pay thee all."

These reflections will not, I hope, be considered captious by Mr. Gavigan or Mr. Maynard. They are not meant in the least to dispute the happy fruit of their findings on the Church in America. So far, so good. But we live in hopes that a visiting critic of the near future may set himself the task of seeing the American Catholic scene and seeing it *whole*. Out of his investigations there may perhaps come something to upset the *mot* of Tarkington's French vampire in "The Plutocrat," that "all Europe has to gain from us is our money." There may come, perhaps, a paraphrase of this judgment made by the Abbé Klein in the work above cited which won for him the Prix Montyon from the Académie Française:—

America, far from appearing to us, as we had expected, a Protestant country where Catholicism is respected, has shown itself a land half theist and half Christian, where Catholicism is, by far, the religion which matters most.*

J. EDWARD COFFEY.

* Leading article, "The Gulf Between."
* Op. cit., p. 28.

ANGLICAN CHURCH THEORIES

SLOWLY and relentlessly the forces of logic are overthrowing the false principles of English Protestantism and driving reasonable non-Catholics from one untenable position after another. Already the descendants of the rebels of the XVIth century have sought to take back much that their forefathers rejected as Popish, un-Scriptural, and idolatrous. It might almost be said of one section of Anglicanism—at least of a part of that section—that they had regained nearly the whole edifice of Catholic truth—except its foundation. Individual doctrines, like Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, above all, the Real Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, and the Sacrifice of the Mass—all repudiated by the Reformers,—are now taught in many Anglican churches, and Catholic practices, like saying the Rosary, making the Stations, using Holy Water, honouring images of the Saints, are fairly general. But the right foundation is still lacking. These acts and beliefs are adopted in spite of, or, at most, with the tolerance of, the Anglican authorities; they are due to individual convictions based on individual reasoning; equally with the general Protestant rejection of Catholic doctrine, they are the fruit of private judgment; their ultimate basis, however the intermediate grounds may obscure the fact, is a personal selection of what seems credible to the particular believer: there is no obedience to a definite living authority, recognized as holding God's commission to teach, which is the foundation of the Catholic's faith.

Still, the practical necessity of being able to appeal to some authority, in a body which proposes to teach divine revelation,—whether it be to the Bible or to the Early Church or to the six first Councils or to the Reformers or to some learned and pious ecclesiastic,—if there is to be any semblance of common faith or regular discipline in that body, has led many Anglicans to ignore the essentially heretical basis of their belief and to claim that they do fulfil the duty of obedience to some external doctrinal standard, however shifting and shadowy. The "Bible-only" Protestant either postulates personal divine guidance or simply has not thought out his position. The furthest removed from old

Protestant prepossessions of all our non-Catholic contemporaries, and, therefore, the most keenly aware of this necessity in the Anglican system, is *The Church Times*, and, naturally enough, it constantly employs its utmost ingenuity to discover a means whereby the duty of belief can be reconciled with an admitted uncertainty of teaching. In a leader in its issue of February 24th it boldly attacks the problem of the "Authority of the Church." The writer begins with an admirable description of the place of authority in the development of knowledge, whether in the race or in the individual; first of all, in the sphere of reason and experience but chiefly in the sphere of revelation. He goes on to point out that Christ taught with authority and imparted that prerogative to His Church: moreover, that reason itself commends this as the obvious way in which, amidst the vast variety of human temperaments and capacities, to preserve and transmit divine revelation. So much any Catholic might be willing to have written, but the remainder of the essay is vitiated by the Anglican conception of a divided Church, infallible as a whole but consisting of fallible parts. The writer is bound to admit in accordance with the XIXth Article that what he calls local Churches—Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Rome and, by implication, England—"have erred . . . in matters of Faith." How then can authority be claimed for bodies which, having been wrong in the past, may possibly be wrong now and in the future? Here is the not very helpful reply—"That which has final authority is that which represents the mind of the entire Church across the world and down the centuries"! Again—how are we to know the mind of this age-long world-wide Church? Very simply. "The mind of the Church as a whole is, in many respects, [note the qualification] quite plain: it is displayed in its immemorial practice and devotions."

We might go on, in further pursuit of this will-o'-the-wisp, to ask—"which are its immemorial practices and devotions?" and no doubt the writer would tell us "those which competent theologians and scholars agree are primitive, or legitimately developed from what is primitive," for such spinners of ecclesiastical theories are never at a loss for words. But, in the end, he would have to admit that ultimately our beliefs would be based on nothing more secure than a consensus of theological experts, fallible minds working in practical isolation on imperfect data, and conveying their unco-

ordinated message in a haphazard fashion by means of books and pamphlets and periodicals, for in this theory there is no central body commissioned to analyse the discussions and discov~~es~~ if there is agreement and in what it consists. Can we imagine the God of Truth, who attaches to the acceptance of His revelation the terrible sanction of eternal loss, making such utterly inadequate provision for its dissemination? Could we say that "the whole Church" was thus "teaching with authority," or, indeed, teaching at all? To these futile devices are those driven who want to find a form of authoritative teaching but will not face the fact that it can be found only in a living and infallible witness, who can teach as our Lord taught, *i.e.*, can answer questions and explain difficulties and settle controversies in the domain of faith and morals, with the authority of God Himself.

Of course, this Anglican writer, and the XIXth Article which he follows, assume that Rome is merely a "local Church" like Jerusalem and the rest, thus in reality begging the whole question. Rome is by usage both local and universal. In the gradual evolution of ecclesiastical government, the Eternal City naturally gave its name to the whole Church, because it was the seat of what was recognized as the primatial See. If Providence had retained St. Peter as Bishop of Antioch, that See would in a similar way have signified the Church in general. "Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia," as an ancient Father puts it. The See of Peter is itself the heart of the Universal Church, and, beating with the same life in all that regards the essentials of faith, worship and discipline, are the "local" Churches all over the world. Even the Eastern Patriarchates before the Schism belonged to the Church Catholic only because they were founded by various members of an Apostolic body whose Head was Peter. The unity of the Church in doctrine, worship and discipline was, and is, thus admirably secured. The Faith of the Church, without diminution, addition or corruption, has thus been triumphantly transmitted through the ages and throughout the world. The authority of the Church is the authority of Christ, infallible in the religious sphere and fully successful in the safeguarding of this revelation. Hence the Church does teach and her Head does rule: functions which religious bodies outside the Fold cannot adequately perform. *The Church Times*, indeed, does not dare to claim for Anglicanism that prerogative of Christ.

The same, or another, leader-writer in a subsequent issue makes this more than plain. Criticizing Bishop Knox's pamphlet on the Malines Conversations in *The Church Times* for March 9th, the writer contends that the Thirty-Nine Articles were framed in ambiguous terms so as to enable persons of different beliefs to accept them. Unfortunately the very title-page of the Articles precludes this disingenuous aim. They are styled—"Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces, and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in the Year 1562, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true religion." We can set this plain declaration aside only by assuming that its authors were dishonest and, not daring at first to teach heresy too openly, clothed it purposely in words of double-meaning. Knowing as we now do their rejection of many fundamental articles of faith, we have no difficulty in supposing them thus guilty. However, *The Church Times* will have it that we have here an instance of the working of its favourite "principle of comprehensiveness," a phrase which, as applied to the teaching of divine truth, is a mere camouflage for ignorance. "The Articles, in their final form, were largely constructed with the intention to refrain from defining. . . . This unmistakable reluctance to define, and by defining to exclude, explains how two different schools of thought could exist inside the Church of England ever since, both holding the same formularies, but placing upon them, in various important respects, a different interpretation." The writer, as we see, is describing a "Church" which has not the very first requisite of the teacher, viz., a knowledge of the truth, and consequently is unable to tell its members, "in various important respects," what they are to believe, concealing its incapacity under the miserable pretence of being "reluctant to define." How alien is this from the spirit of the commission which our Lord gave to the Apostles—"teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you"—not to refrain from defining even "hard sayings" for fear of excluding the indocile! What a comment on that glorious promise of God Incarnate to be with His Church all days! All days? "For the moment," says *The Church Times*,¹ "we must accept the fact of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England, even though we may believe that *Catholicism and Protestantism are mu-*

¹ March 9th, p. 271. Italic ours.

tually contradictory and mutually destructive." What an abject confession for a "Church" claiming continuity with the Church of the Apostles, that Church which resounded with the, emphatic definitions and the ringing anathemas of St. Paul! "For the moment," at any rate, the Church of England, without authority to define, still less to reject, what is heretical, has no part with the Church founded by Christ, who foretold the doom of the house divided against itself. The search for authority, apart from the Body which is endowed with the indefectibility and the infallibility of Christ Himself, is necessarily vain.

The Church Times is not alone in thus trying to palliate this root defect in Anglicanism. In fact, none are more candid in disclaiming the prerogative of teaching with certainty than the very men who, if they were true descendants of the Apostles, should be the first to claim it for the Church,—viz., the Bishops of the Establishment. Here, for instance, is a recent episcopal pronouncement on Eucharistic doctrine—the chief source of division amongst Anglicans—"Whatever be our own views of the Eucharist, we must confess that truth is too great a thing for any individual or party to be able to claim a monopoly,"¹ the implication of course being that one need not apply to the "Church" for a decision between conflicting doctrines as to the nature of the chief mystery of the Christian faith! Once more, what in this theory has become of the commission of Christ to the Apostles? Some anxious "Anglo-Catholics" find what comfort they can in the fact that certain Catholic theologians, including Bossuet, thought that one section, at any rate, of Article XXVIII. could be interpreted in a Catholic sense. A slender consolation, for it is only apart from the known intentions of its framers, and from the gloss conveyed by the 15th Protestant Homily, and from three centuries of Lutheran interpretation, that that Article can even superficially be freed from heresy. As we know, the task of reading the Catholic faith into those anti-Catholic formularies proved too much for the great intellect and candid soul of Newman, but each generation sees the effort renewed, so undying is the longing of the disinherited for their lost Faith, so impossible is it to reconcile traditional Protestantism with any theory of the Church which will not affront reason and deny historical truth. Can such persons be satisfied with another *Church Times* dictum (Mar.

¹ March Pastoral of the Bishop of Derby, quoted in *Church Times*, Mar. 9, p. 274.

9th)—“The Church of England is a body in process of becoming, not of being, something definite in its rules.”? The reference is to fasting communion, a practice which Anglicanism has never insisted on, and to the proposal to embody this negative attitude in a rubric, *sc.*, “that Fasting Communion may be used or left, without breaking any regulation of the Church of England, as every man’s devotion serveth without blame.” Let the practice go on as before—such seems *The Church Times*’ attitude,—but do not “officially stereotype the difference between those who believe in and comprehend the mystery of the Holy Sacrament and those who do not,” by calling attention to it in a rubric. “Any attempt [we read further on] to crystallize our mind at the present moment would be disastrous. We are prepared to live and let live.”

In the spirit of this utterance was a “Plea for Toleration,” issued on February 21st by a prominent group of “Anglo-Catholics,” two dozen in number, both clerical and lay, on the curious ground that the English Church was “a microcosm of Christendom” and that its providential function, indicated by its medley of opposing doctrines, was “to bridge the gulf between widely separated Christian bodies.” We might have quoted this singular appeal in our remarks last month on the absence in Anglicanism, even in its most “Catholic” section, of the slightest appreciation of the evil and sin of heresy—a defect due to the absence of any teaching authority worthy of the name. The pleaders in this case who all, no doubt, believe in the Real Presence, “have no desire *whatever* to deprive Evangelicals of (for example) evening Communion . . . nor have we *any* sympathy with a campaign of heresy-hunting directed against Modernists.” (Italics ours.) And they claim the support of “nearly all the younger generation of Anglo-Catholics.” Here we see the suicidal “policy of comprehensiveness,” which equivalently denies any certain revelation, formally adopted by the Anglican party that should most thoroughly repudiate it. We are bound to say that another “Anglo-Catholic” group, only less numerous than the former, immediately issued a protest¹ against this policy of give and take, and scorned buying permission to adore Christ present in the Eucharist “at the price of making it easier for others to deny His Truth or disobey His Church.” But even they admit that Modernists and Evangelicals are properly part of the Church of England of which

¹ *Church Times*, March 16th.

"Anglo-Catholicism" is only a section, and they show no concern about being associated in the same communion with those who "deny God's Truth and disobey His Church." The fact is that in their own desire to escape submission to the one, dogmatic, authoritative, infallible Church, sketched in many a parable by Christ and instituted at Pentecost, they have lost any intelligible conception of the Church's character and functions.

In the March issue of *Theology* (published by the S.P.C.K.) yet another theory of the Church is broached by Mr. Will Spens, a well-known Anglican controversialist. He, at any rate, recognizes that the Catholic doctrine is essentially and fundamentally opposed to all others, a fact which the unhappy Malines Conversations had temporarily obscured in the minds of some few Catholics abroad. And he goes on to make that opposition still more clear and distinct by suggesting that the Catholic conception of the Church as a society is a mistaken one, for, once that was admitted, it would necessarily follow that the claims of the Roman Church to be the Church which Christ founded were irresistible. *Quod est* [so the argument suggests] *absurdum*. So we must try to discover some other way of explaining the notorious fact that Christendom is split up into a number of competing "Churches," whereas Christ founded only one Church and meant it to continue One. Mr. Spens thinks he has discovered a way of reconciling the facts with Christ's declared intention. The prerogative of unity with which He endowed His Church was not that which springs from a central source of authority and power, such as regulates and holds together a corporation, but that which belongs to a nation, a single people racially akin, which may indeed in ideal circumstances find institutional expression in a single homogeneous State, but which ordinarily exists in a combination with other peoples and has no other unity than that which is connoted by a common language, traditions and customs. He finds support for this view in certain Scripture passages which he does not quote but which, as he understands them, "assert or immediately imply the conception of the Church as the New Israel." He would seem, then, to claim on the strength of these passages that the unity of Christianity is analogous to that of Judaism, and he sees confirmation of his theory in the undoubted fact that the grace of God is visibly operating in many Christian bodies, which Catholics must regard as schis-

matic or heretical—branches severed from the Vine or never even connected with it. The unity is there, in spiritual regeneration, but unfortunately deprived by circumstances of institutional expression. Christ's Church was already in existence in the hearts of believers before He gave her her first commission at Pentecost: she remains in existence in the same way, in spite of her failure to preserve corporate unity.

Mr. Spens develops his argument at much length, but seems more concerned with an attempt to demolish the Catholic conception than to give logical consistency to his own. He abounds in partial views and half-truths. He cannot deny that the descriptions, given by our Lord and the Apostles, of the Church all point most emphatically to her being a society of believers: he cannot deny that, historically, the Church started by having "one mind and one soul," and that the process of ejecting those alien to her spirit is to be seen at work from the beginning. He ignores the fact that God always responds to the longings of good will and sincerity wherever found; that, "in every nation he that feareth Him and doth justice is received by Him";¹ that the manifest fruits of grace amongst the sects is therefore no disproof of the true Church's unicity. That Church was described by its Founder as a Flock led and fed by its own Shepherd, as a Sheepfold not to be entered save by the gate, as a City set upon a Hill, as a House built upon a Rock, as a fenced Vineyard, as a Living Vine, as a Field producing both wheat and tares, as a Draw-net enclosing all variety of fish, as, finally, a Kingdom—vivid metaphors, all pointing to something external, visible, one, and all compatible with the other Scripture analogy, of which Mr. Spens makes so much, of a multitude, naturally "not a people" but made supernaturally "the people of God." And the crown is furnished to the Catholic conception by the impressive metaphor, so beloved by St. Paul—the Living Body, with its close and conscious union of parts, and single source of operation. Although he is aware of the pit and tries to avoid it, Mr. Spens in fact falls into the old delusion about the "Invisible Church" whose only Head is Christ in Heaven. It is unnecessary to dwell on this ancient fallacy. Who is to point out those who are spiritually regenerate? Amidst the vast variety of creeds who is to determine the truth? Has God made a revelation and left to chance the knowledge of it?

¹ St. Peter in Acts x. 35.

Is He not anxious that men should think aright as well as act aright? Where is the evidential value of a unity the existence and extent of which is known only to God? We do not argue *a priori* in this matter, as Mr. Spens insinuates, arranging with our limited intellects what it should beseem God to do, and, on those grounds, stating what He has done. We simply use those intellects—apt instruments within their limits—to grasp the truth as He has set it forth. And the truth is that the God of justice has attached the penalty of eternal loss to disbelief in His revelation and, therefore, has made that revelation certain by endowing His mouthpiece, the living Church, with infallibility in its transmission. We only believe that He has done what He promised to do.¹

Mr. Spens, in support of his anti-Catholic argument, winds up with a claim which shows how deeply Modernism has permeated the mentality even of the highest Anglicans. He claims that his Church has selected its creed on an empirical basis, holding firmly those doctrines which are "very closely related to devotional experience," whilst "it rejects, or *sits lightly to*," [what unconscious self-revelation in the italicized phrase!] those which "have been developed in the excogitation of intellectual systems." We have no wish to contest that claim—let devout "Anglo-Catholics" look to it,—for it is the usual assertion of private judgment as against belief on authority, which no non-Catholic can escape. Mr. Spens himself is conscious of this, and note how he meets the charge.

If it be urged [he concludes] that such a view turns theology into an empirical science, and opens the possibility that even our fundamental beliefs may be set aside, it may well be replied in regard to the latter point that, for example, the doctrine of the Incarnation could only be set aside if (as we believe, *per impossibile*) some doctrine which treated our Lord as merely man proved a better guide in leading men to God; and, in regard to the former point, that we can scarcely advance better the claims of theology than by showing that it is entitled at least to the respect with which men have learnt to treat the empirical sciences.

¹ Mr. Spens quotes with approval what seems to us, frankly, a singularly futile parallel intended to ridicule the claim of "Rome" to be the whole Church. "There are some people who say the plate can't be broken, because the bit which has got P on it is always the whole plate." This sneer implies that bodies which break off from the Church take from her some part of her doctrine, leaving her in some way maimed and imperfect; a supposition grotesquely false.

Is not this an admission of complete doctrinal bankruptcy? He rests the security of fundamental beliefs on what he personally considers the impossibility of a merely human Christ helping men better to attain their end than a divine One—not on our Lord's own testimony, as preserved and interpreted by His Church! What sort of Christian teaching is this? By what process could it be shown to the satisfaction of the dubious or incredulous that belief in Christ's Divinity has *de facto* brought men better to God than has disbelief in that dogma? The Modernists, to whom Mr. Spens shows such deference, will deny that any false doctrine, such as they consider the Godhead of Christ to be, can properly lead to God. And the same impracticability applies to the still more fundamental doctrine of the Trinity. And as for theology, which in the Catholic sense is simply right reason applied to the facts of revelation, to what depths has it sunk in Anglicanism if it must go, hat in hand, to the physical sciences, which advance by trial and error, to plead for admission into their ranks!

One last word will make the Catholic position plain and justify "the oracular theory of authority," as distinct from the twists and turns to which men resort to escape the *rationale obsequium*, the obedience of faith, so abhorrent to human pride. The Church, like its Founder, "came into the world to give testimony to the Truth." She was commissioned by her Founder to expel, as heathen and publicans, those who would not hear her voice. She was endowed by our Lord with the same teaching power as the Father had given Him. Therefore, she cannot but teach like Him with authority, to which in its sphere absolute obedience is due, and which accordingly must be absolutely certain. Only the Catholic Church whose centre is in Rome makes even the claim to reproduce these characteristics of our Lord's magisterial office. Only her rulers have ever dared to preface their decisions with the awful words—"It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." The admission in the Anglican Articles that Churches and General Councils may and have erred gives the death-blow to the claim of the Establishment to be part of the indefectible Church of Christ.

JOSEPH KEATING.

FALLEN LEAVES. II

III

MENIPPOS had had a son whom Polubos had insisted should be called Medon, for, said he, forgetfulness during two generations of the divine name of the family must have angered Zeus their ancestor, and hence disaster had flowed. For he considered Menippus a mere curse. Yet after the flight of Menippus he paid no more attention to the little Medon, who grew up a lad loving the sea but loving even more the Muses, and he spent the days swimming, dreaming and in song, even from his boyhood. Somehow this made him beloved by boys who were opposite to himself: his friends were lusty lads who could run and row and shout the ordinary verses that all knew, but they could not add to them, nor connect ancient stories nor, above all, did any song make them suddenly feel blind as it were or sick with terrible joy, as even a word—as even somewhat that was no word, but within the word, could do to Medon, though not often. At such moments, every enclosure seemed to burst away from around him: he had no body, neither was he anywhere. So it easily became the custom among them to take Medon with them when they sailed hither or thither, and he became almost a second time that old ancestor of his, Medon, who had left the vale of Tempeä and used to sing songs on the decks of the Iavones and was drowned under Olumpos. Above all, they took him willingly to the island Delos, when they sailed thither for Apollon. For to this midmost island of the westward sea men came immemorially both from north and east to do worship to that god. Year by year pilgrims with tribute came even from the far north, with voices so different from what the easterners were accustomed to, that they could scarcely understand them. Dorians, too, used to come there, not only from the southern parts of the mainland where they had settled, Karia, Pamphulia, but above all, from the great island Kreté, one-third of which now belonged to them, and these Dorians used to say that Apollon was their god more than anyone else's, and many fights came from this, but mostly the Dorians killed their fellow-

worshippers because they were very sturdy. But the priest of the enclosure of Apollon did not at all like these killings to take place upon his island and ended by saying that no one ought either to die or to be born upon Delos, for the god felt himself polluted by death, and even when his arrows slew men, for their sins, with pestilence, they did so from afar; and as for birth, Apollon had himself been born in Delos and any other births would contaminate it. No one knew when this story of the god's birth in Delos had first been told, and some laughed at it, and Athamas, a special friend of Medon, used to maintain it had been invented lest Putho should get too proud as owning the god altogether. But the priests of these two places were wise to see that they had better not be rivals, and they sent one another presents, and this pleased Medon, because he was a gentle and happy boy and did not like fighting, and sang ever the praises of Apollon's birth in Delos.

One spring, when Medon was twelve, a party was made up to sail across to Delos. It was a party such as the boy liked, because it was all young men, his friends, and had no women in it. Sometimes women went to Delos, to dance there, but they made him afraid to sing as he best liked. They laughed at him, and, as they sat in the bottom of the ship under the rowers' thwarts, they grumbled at the wet, and also would call up to him asking for those tales of the gods that he liked least, and before the journey finished it became always a riot that he did not like to watch, for he had none but thoughts clear as water when Apollon himself shot his golden darts across it. The party had six young men in it, of whom three were his special friends, Telemakhos, an ancient name and of good omen, Zethos, and Athamas, and the boat belonged to Athamas. It had blue cheeks, and at the stern were spreading rays of scarlet, like the sun arising. Medon used to sit on the high prow-deck, so as to look forward into the horizon and descry the islands, and sing to the sky, and also suffer the wind to blow his voice back to the men as they rowed even though their backs were turned. Medon used to call greetings to the waves that kept running forward and forward, curling and rising in little ridges, and even above his song, or the songs of the oarsmen, he could hear them, he thought, lisping and whispering, and the different sound of the splash of the oars in the water and the

dripping of the water off their broad-blades. Each man had his oar that he loved, and Medon could distinguish them and said he could tell when one man might row a skill-less stroke, by the noise of the leathern thong around the thole-pin, but they laughed at him for saying this, and said he but guessed, when he cried out the right name without turning to see. When all went well, Medon exulted. 'The ship,' cried he, 'guesses her own way in her mind! Swift speeds she as wing or as a thought of man!' Good-humouredly they mocked him: 'My sweat,' called Athamas back to him, 'costs more than thought, and a sweatless voyage would not carry you to Delos, thought you never so swiftly.' Medon felt that it would. His thoughts leapt swiftly forward like a god. 'Ah, were I there—or there!' he thought in himself; and if he came there, he grieved almost, when he stood in the place upon his feet. For the place seemed less divine. Sitting on his deck, he would wish to go forward for ever, shooting arrows of thought ahead of him: yet even so they fell in Okeānos—the eternal ocean flooding back upon itself as it circled and circled the world, with gentle foam upon the water so unfathomably black that it seemed never to move. Yet it sang ever the eternal song, one single note that was all notes together. Then suddenly Medon shrank: upon that Ocean he too would go for ever round and round: and terror gripped his throat, and he warded to escape and be a hawk or eagle and fly upwards. But even so, he would strike the bronze heaven, or the sun would burn him up. However, when they paused, for weariness, even though the sail carried the ship forward Medon showed he could do more than think, for even were it rough, he would dive, dive even off the ship, like a man diving for oysters, plunging and rolling over in the deep water like a dolphin, slipping this way and that like any eel, and the gulls played over him. For this bravery they loved him.

They would start very early, lest winds should baffle them, and lest they should have the horror of a night at sea without stars. In the afternoon the great granite mount of Kuthnos, in the midst of the island, would show itself behind the little island Múkonos, a mountain sheer on this eastward side into the sea, and they would sail round the southern tip of Delos to the part facing Rheneia

where a strip of land lay between the mountain and the sea. There they would row in to the tiny harbour, fasten the stern to a stake, and drop pierced stones from the prow to steady the boat even though she was small. It was still afternoon when, this time, they landed, and forthwith they ate, having given a little of their parched grain to Apollon Patroös, who loved neither flesh nor blood. Though there was, this time, no festival, yet in the spring there were always a certain number of pilgrims in Delos, and the men spent that evening in chatter, for both worship and games, feasting and love, should best be left for the morrow. Medon, however, used to separate himself so soon as possible from his comrades, and he went all the way up the ravine of the river Inopos, that split the mountain, to where the oracle of Apollon was built by the divine palm-tree. Medon had been told that there were other palm trees, even quite near his home, but he had never seen any, and he liked to think that this was the only one. For Apollon had been born beneath it. He did not visit the oracle to question it, but sat beneath it, by the altar, and looked out into the west where Rheneia and other islands lay like shadows. He had joy to feel himself thus drenched by the enormous sunset, as though Phoibos, god of purification, were entering even into his body, as he triumphed already in his thoughts. Beneath him he could see the houses of the little town, golden in the rays, and the bright patch of the wrestling-ground, and a pool where sacred fish lived that belonged to the priest of the place. He went inside the little wall and clasped the palm tree in his arms, and Leto, the mother of the god, put her own arms round the boy and he wept sweetly.

Next day in the morning the men boxed and danced and Medon sang the hymns that they wanted of him, not as his heart bade him, yet reverently, since the god wished it so: and after the meal, the women danced, alone, and then with the men, a Crane dance, that they could all perform, and a Labyrinth dance, which was so difficult that only the Kretan women danced it, around the altar that rose at the corners into horns, that their countrymen had put up. Medon's companions always had some contempt for these Kretans, and still more for the Darians, but Medon had good will for them, because of their great

affection for Apollon. He had no jealousy of the riches of Putho; only, he mocked the story that some of the northerners told, that Apollon had been born in another place, Tégura, in Boiotia; for he knew very well that the mother of the god had merely passed that way, being led in the form of a she-wolf by wolves, until she gave birth to her son beneath the palm-tree. And again, when night fell, and the others were all very drunk and were singing among the women the praises of the god, Medon went back to the palm-tree, and put his arms round it and was sure that the exhausted goddess had done so long ago, after her weary journey from the north, visiting island after island, all of whom feared to receive her because of the hate that Heré had for her; but Delos received her, and for that Leto promised it that Apollon should love it beyond all other islands, as indeed he did, though the timid rock, in its modesty, feared that Apollon, on his birth, would scorn it for its rockiness and kick it over and the sea should sweep over it and itself become a home but for seals and cuttlefish. But the generous god, bursting his swaddling-clothes, claimed forthwith from Zeus the gifts of lyre and oracle, and the island became vocal and could look behind itself to the future that came darkly up towards it. In thinking thus, Medon was very happy.

The next morning they started their return journey. They spoke but little, and sang not at all. The foolish wine still lay upon their wits, and one or two who had drunk less were still thinking of the girl of yesterday. Medon sat on his deck and dreamed, but even in him, the dream lacked the gaiety of departure. Besides this, the sky was heavy upon them. Slow cormorants dipped to and fro near the islands and the gulls were screaming. The sea darkened with a soundless wave. There would be wind; but now the flood heaved idly, nor could they guess what gale Zeus would ordain. There was a mist very soon upon the sea, and the sun ceased to be gold, and the foam seemed yellow. Towards evening the breeze freshened: yet it did not stir the mist: the sun disappeared before the boat had come near to the mainland, and the pine-mast in its socket groaned and the sail flapped. Quite suddenly the sky seemed heaped with cloud, and a sheet of spray swept over the water, drenching the men. The gale struck the boat before she was ready for it, on the

flank: she reeled; they twisted her about, but there was already much water in her. The men tugged desperately, and Medon lowered the sail and almost at once they ceased rowing and the oars clattered on the water. It was now quite dark, but lightning tore the dark, and once, in the lightning, they saw another ship that dissolved suddenly before them like a cloud and disappeared. At this, the men covered their heads with their cloaks and wept and tried no more so much as to steer her. They shrieked to Zeus to make a clear air and show even one star, that in a manner they might at least die in the light. It was Medon who leapt from his deck to the tiller and strove to keep her head true. Rain fell like iron or like ice: they could see nothing till in sudden flashes they might descry, heaving past them, pieces of wood, or seaweed: branches of trees tossed by them too, and suddenly, in a lull of the wind, they heard the growl of breakers upon rocks. Death on those gnashing teeth seemed better than the green death of the sea and the nibbling of fat by fish that would await them: Medon cried loudly to Apollon, covered his head too with his cloak, and put the ship straight towards the uproar. There was a crash and a sound of grinding millstones, and the ship parted into its timbers, and the men were swept forth into the water and thence high on to a beach. Madly they caught hold of rocks: Medon and his three friends and another, Itulos, gripped them and clung: the other two were torn away, and vanished into the surf. Their bodies, with no bone unbroken, were found there in the daytime.

All of the men lay stunned at first, but after a while sat up, glad out of death, but weeping forthwith for their comrades and with fear for not knowing where they were. They fell down and kissed the rock and did homage to the gods of the place and waited, weeping bitterly, for dawn. Dawn came misty, and very soon they heard a rattle of stones as a man slid down the rocks to the shore. He was looking for timber and anything else that shipwreck might have left. They ran to him and clasped his knees, but he was harder than rocks or sea and would not help them. They waited, in their naked weakness, till he had picked up wood and cuttlefish with pebbles still clinging to them as the storm had torn them from their houses, and then marked the track up the cliff by which

he had descended, and tried to follow where he went; but they did not know the secret of the path and Itulos fell and his brains were beaten from his skull on the rock where they had crouched. Weeping still more bitterly, they descended, threw sand on him and raised a cry, and then once more climbed, and some god was guide, for they reached a ledge and a hut, and a fisherman who to their amazement told them that this was the great island Khios that lay like a hollow moon against the mainland. Then again they fell down to thank the gods and Apollon Phanaios who had an enclosure looking upon the harbour there, for Athamas exclaimed that living in that island was his uncle, Mérion, who had a house there, and no small wealth, for he was a singer concerning ancient heroes and received many gifts. But, as the woman of the hut was beginning to tell them what part of the island they had reached, the men, who had been drinking black broth with a little wine in it, rolled over and went to sleep till after noonday, near the fire that the woman blew into flame from among the ash, for she was careful, and never suffered the seed of fire to die.

When they woke, they laughed, for in the water they had long since thrown away even their tunics, and only with pieces of woven reeds, and some rags that she had, could they cover themselves, so as to seek out Merion's house, and even these they had to promise they would return, for the fisherfolk were very poor, but they trusted them, since the gods had evidently protected them, and besides, they knew Merion by repute for a man of abundance. They then put them on the track towards the house.

"My uncle," said Athamas, "is a man who will welcome us not least for the sake of Medon, for my uncle is a man who loves songs, and though Medon is but a self-taught bard and the god puts it all into his head, still he will be glad to see him, for bard calls to bard, and none can string his lyre more swiftly than Medon can." Then he paused, and anxiety enveloped him. "But there will be my aunt, comrades," he went on, "a woman of unapproachable hands—not with her would you whisper by rock or by oak! The gods be kind! A Gorgon-head sent up from Hades to terrify men like me... Melanippé! But courage. We have seen worse. One day even this shall be but a memory."

This was a word of those which made Medon feel, he knew not why, that there was neither past nor future, joy nor pain, but that all things were one thing, and that even woe was lovable.

They struck into a better path, and saw runnels of stone from springs with elms above them, and venerated the nymph of each; and soon they saw houses, and everyone took pity on them and especially on the boy Medon, and gave them shirts and even a cloak or two, and wished to feed them, but Athamas wanted to hurry on for by now he knew where he was. "Soon," said he, "we shall see the house. A house with a garden and a wall of dug stones with split stakes above it like a farm. The gods send we see not first Melanippé, a man-woman, a woman capable of being even now in the garden, with gloves and gaiters, mending the harm done by the storm to her pet shoots. God grant we see first my uncle: a foolish man in many ways, but that will give us at once to eat, for more shameless than a dog is an empty stomach barking within. And there are jars of wine in a row beside the wall. God grant the doors are not locked. We will steal up and before they know it, we shall be amongst them. Even Melanippé would not turn us thence, for she puts Nemesis and Aidōs in her mind in spite of everything."

Thus chattering, he led them till he showed the house, on its little platform, on the rounded back of the island looking across the sea. No one was in the garden, and they crept close to the double doors and they were not locked. But, pushing them open, they forgot the wind. The wind hurled itself into the house, and seized a curtain over an inner door, and the whole room seemed forthwith full of flying shrivelled leaves. A bald man sitting at a table sprang up with a cry and clasped at the leaves with one hand, and with the other pressed to the table those that had not yet flown away. Athamas sprang forward to catch yet others and upset a jar of cuttle-fish venom that had stood there and then the man yelled louder. Medon felt as though all the Furies were flying about the room, and the more, when through the inner door came, clearly, Melanippé.

She saw only Athamas, for the others cowered back behind the curtain, and for a while the air was on fire with her outcry, and a little maid stood whimpering beside her.

"Dog-faced! Kuklops! Adamas - Athamas!" she shrieked. "What are you doing here? See what you have done! His papyrus! Shut the doors! Blind and Gorgon-struck! Cannot you see what you are doing?"

"My papyrus! my papyrus!" moaned Merion, who was hunting scraps of brittle papyrus where they fluttered in corners.

"Fool!" cried his wife, turning upon him: "Did I not tell you? Did I not say that a curse was on the papyrus? Papyrus! I ask you! That a bard should make marks with sepia on papyrus because he cannot remember his songs. You will remember them less and less!"

"My dear," he sighed, "I have told you so often that it is for the sake of those in unborn generations. Mine are the best songs. None puts together as I do the ancient tales of men. And I put only one sign, two signs, to show where now to pick up the tale, what song must now be asked from memory."

To Medon for a moment the thing seemed horrible, that the deeds and lives of men should be confided thus to brittle leaves that blew about in winds from one year into the next. O what is life, he thought with a thought swift as lightning and no longer. O what is strength! What are men, what is the mind of man? What shall endure? But at that moment, Melanippé, who had herself been collecting the leaves, for she was proud behind her mind of the marks that her husband could make, saw the other three who had ventured from behind the curtain. She stood staring.

Athamas hastened to explain.

"O worthiest Melanippé!" he cried. "See us, men but now saved from sheer death and the sea. All the night through. . . . Not one star, not one peeping sinister star! Khios? who knew this would be Khios? Gladly would we have seen so much as the smoke rising from your house. These very clothes are not ours. Be propitious! I look on you as a goddess, as a Heré, wife of Zeus himself."

But Melanippé was looking at Medon.

"But one is a mere child," she cried; and, since her heart was good, and she saw that his teeth were chattering, she led him to the fire, that burned because of the mist, and sat him near it. "That is like my aunt," said

Athamas to himself: "she flings her arms round a weakling and disdains the better man." But he did not really grudge the welcome to Medon, but was hurt having been treated as a baby in the presence of his friends.

"You shall stay here to-day," said Merion, contented that he had gathered up all his leaves and that none had been broken. "The south wind has sent mist such as thieves love, and you could neither cross to the land nor even reach the harbour."

"Athamas," said Melanippé, "having eaten shall help me in my garden. Thank God the onions and the parsley cannot have been hurt, but the orchard will need binding. O fate! that you must needs have built your house this side of the island!" she exclaimed to Merion. "He says he cannot sing in his mind, unless he sees the sea! Yet sing he must, for one must live. And what are bards to-day? Unhonoured, unfeasted by the hearth of any king. And what are the kings? Soft-handed as the bards! What is life any more to-day? Yet live one must."

She heated a footbath, and they told her all about their sailing and of the man who would not help them, and they slept again, and woke at the hour of supper. But Medon's teeth were still chattering and his thoughts were like dreams, but dreams that could have no meaning, and his head swayed like a poppy on its stalk.

C. C. MARTINDALE.

(To be continued.)

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

THE LIQUEFACTION OF BLOOD RELICS.

The Case of St. Pantaleone.

ON page 126 of *THE MONTH* for February, 1927, Fr. Thurston writes: "If we could suppose some substance or mixture had been accidentally discovered which hardened when shut up in the dark, but melted more or less rapidly when exposed to the light of day in a warmer atmosphere, it would be easy to understand the multiplication of alleged relics of this character, which undoubtedly seems to have taken place in the latter part of the sixteenth century." Further, on page 129 of the same issue, he proceeds:—

From the various accounts of these and other kindred phenomena which I have come across, I must confess that I am strongly inclined to believe that such alleged blood-relics *always* liquefied if they were exposed long enough to light and air. The casual visitor who might ask to venerate them on ordinary occasions, would be allowed to inspect them only for a few minutes, after which they would be replaced in their receptacles, sufficient time not having elapsed for any notable change to be observed. If a rapid liquefaction did chance to occur, an explanation was found in the fact that someone had a relic of the True Cross about him, or that the Blessed Sacrament was near, or that God wished to reward the special devotion of the visitor. No one, unfortunately, seems to have attempted to test the phenomena in a critical spirit, and indeed it is likely that the custodians would not readily lend themselves to further any such endeavour.

The above words come closely after Fr. Thurston's discussion of the Blood-Relic of St. Pantaleone, at Ravello, near Amalfi, and it is in this connection that I wish to describe what once I myself witnessed there.

The Relic purports to be the Blood of St. Pantaleone, preserved from his beheading at Nicomedia, in the early fourth century. It was, not long afterwards, transported to Constantinople, whence it was brought to Ravello, where there is documentary evidence of its being venerated as early as in the twelfth century. Without further trespass on the domain of the hagiographer, let me confine myself to describing the Relic, its position, and the circumstances under which I saw it liquefy, leaving my

readers to draw their own conclusions as to how far Fr. Thurston's suggested solution goes to explain what I saw.

Position of the Reliquary. It is shrined in the Blessed Sacrament Chapel of the Cathedral. An aperture, some 18 inches square, has been cut in the wall of the Chapel above the Altar Tabernacle; on the floor of this aperture stands the Reliquary. A strong sheet of glass is let into the framework of this aperture, both back and front. There is also an iron-gilt railing in front and a double iron-gilt railing in rear. The glass and the railings are all permanent fixtures. Great force would be required to remove them. Light, to a certain extent, reaches the Reliquary through the two panes of glass and through these railings.

Behind this aperture there is a small landing, or platform, situated in a little alcove, reached by two small semi-circular stairs which meet each other at its level. Access is gained to these stairs by two small doors, one on each side of the Altar of the Blessed Sacrament. With regard to the light which may penetrate to the Reliquary, a very great deal will depend upon whether these two doors are open or shut.

The little alcove above mentioned has a small window, which also admits a certain amount of light, but, being situated 12½ feet above the platform, and within the very narrow confines of the alcove, no great quantity of light reaches the Reliquary from that source. It is almost permanently closed, admitting only a small and invariable amount of air. Hence the only *variation* in light and air is caused by the little doors being open or shut and by the amount of artificial light in the Church. Those doors are always kept locked, except on the Feast of the Traslocazione of the Relic, on the Vespers of the Feast, and for the subsequent period during which the Blood remains liquid.

Whatever variation there may be in the temperature surrounding the Relic must depend upon the temperature of the Cathedral as a whole, and particularly that of the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, in the wall of which it is kept.

The Phenomena of Liquefaction. I twice visited Ravello in 1924. The following Notes, taken most carefully by myself on those occasions, give my impressions. On my first visit I found, to my great satisfaction, that I had arrived on the Eve of the Feast of the Traslocazione, on which occasion the Relic was exposed throughout the entire day, giving me thus the fullest opportunities to visit, inspect, sketch, and discuss it.

As to the conditions of light, air and temperature in which the Relic was exposed, well, it was mid-May, and already very hot. Moreover, throngs of people, the whole day long, were passing through the Church, crowding and pressing up those few narrow steps to the crowded platform behind the Reliquary, each seeming to diffuse his or her special brand of caloric. There

was also a very large number of candles in front of the Shrine, and electric lights were blazing everywhere, especially around the Altar of the Blessed Sacrament, whose Tabernacle is immediately beneath the Relic. When thus recording my impressions of extreme heat, I had, of course, no thought of Fr. Thurston's theory, of which, indeed, I was ignorant. It was when I met the theory afterwards that I re-read my notes and found conditions as I have described them, without there being any liquefaction. Before narrating my second visit, let me describe the contents of the Reliquary.

Contents of the Reliquary. The Reliquary is a circular disc-shaped glass vessel, its face and back being flat. It contains in its lowest part, for its capacity is much greater than its contents, a stratum of dark, opaque substance, which tradition declares to be some of the sand, or soil, on which the Blood fell when the head was severed from the trunk. Then comes a stratum of whitish substance, and, above it, a very narrow ribbon-like band of blood, dark brown in colour, and, like those beneath, perfectly opaque. Then a band of what suggests dried-up fat; whilst, lastly, a little above the fatty substance, a line of tiny dried-up bubbles, marking the highest altitude attained by the fatty substance during the liquefaction. Entirely separate from, and considerably higher than, the above, inside the glass, are a few non-transparent splashes of reddish-brown colour.

On the outer surface of the Reliquary there was a great accumulation of fine dust, a fact which shows that it could not have been handled for a very considerable time; and a large crack extending from a little below the level of the Blood and running up over the shoulder of the Reliquary and down its other side, the result, it is said, of an accident. In 1759, the Blood being at the moment in a liquid state, a certain Canon approached the flame of a candle so near to the glass that it cracked. The Blood began to ooze through. The Canon besought the Saint to arrest the disaster. The flow immediately stopped, but there remain on the outside of the fissure certain dark-brown drops like wax; the fissure itself appeared to me so wide as to make the retention of anything fluid above its level impossible.

It was in July of that same year that I paid my second visit to Ravello and witnessed the Liquefaction.

The Liquefaction. On Saturday, July 19th, 1924, immediately after the 6 a.m. Mass, the Arch-Priest beckoned to me to mount to the little platform behind the shrine of the Reliquary and examine its contents. This was the first inspection since the *Traslocazione* in May, and there was no perceptible change.

On the following Wednesday, July 23rd, at the same hour, we assembled again on the platform. At first the contents seemed undisturbed, and my companions became anxious, because on the

last occasion on which the Liquefaction had not taken place the Great War followed, and, after the other previous failure on the records, cholera had scourged Ravello. However, we all knelt for a moment, and, after the Arch-Priest had recited a brief prayer, we rose, and instantly perceived that the liquefaction had begun. We all most clearly saw that the left half of the narrow ribbon of Blood had become, thus suddenly, lucent, transparent, a bright, brilliant red, absolutely clear, the redness of a ruby. And when I examined the Reliquary from the front, I saw quite distinctly that the dark brown nodules which projected from the crack had become wet, almost, but not quite liquid, although their colour remained as heretofore.

Now obviously there could be no question here of the suggested "psychic force exercised by the concentrated will of a large body of devout believers,"¹ for the spectators present, however devout, were only four in number.

Nor does there seem to be room for the other suggested cause, extreme heat. Up to a late hour on the Vigil, July 26th, the liquefaction had not completed itself, and Priests and people were growing anxious. But on the following day, the Festa, Sunday, July 27th, I was able to note that the prodigy had been fully accomplished that morning. There could be no doubt now about the liquid character of the formerly congealed drops adhering to the outside of the Ampolla, and a closer examination made on Tuesday, July 29th, showed them to be dark red when backed by the Blood inside and lighter when they had behind them the milk-like substance previously noted.

On Wednesday, July 30th, a little before 5 a.m., I examined the Reliquary again for the especial purpose of noting what had occurred in regard to the dark brown "splashes" high up on the inside of the Ampolla. Their colour, too, had changed to bright red.

Now all these changes had occurred irrespective, so to say, of atmospheric conditions. The Cathedral was quite cool when the liquefaction began on July 23rd. But it remained arrested during the rest of that day, and until the Feast itself, although the church was constantly crammed with people, innumerable candles and electric lights burning, and the heat sometimes almost intolerable. Both the doors leading up to the platform were open during the day. On the other hand, on the Sunday morning, when the liquefaction completed itself, the interior of the Cathedral was quite cool up to about 11 a.m.; it was a fresh morning with a considerable number of clouds obscuring the July sun, and a pleasant breeze had succeeded a night so chilly as to necessitate extra coverings in bed.

¹ Fr. Thurston in *Catholic Medical Guardian*, April, 1926, p. 58.

I have now described my own experiences regarding this Ravello prodigy. Another portion of St. Pantaleone's blood is preserved, not only at Naples, as Fr. Thurston has pointed out, but in the Convent of the Incoronazione, at Madrid. Dr. Cronin, D.D., at my request, investigated the phenomena connected with this relic, and found that it changed on the Eve of the Feast (July 26th), while being venerated in a movable phial in church, from a hard, dry, solid substance like caked dust of a very dark brown colour into what appeared to be fresh, freely-flowing, translucent blood, remained so during the Feast, and gradually solidified again in the following night. At Ravello, on the contrary, it appears that the blood remains liquid for rather more than six weeks after the Feast, whilst that preserved at Vallo della Lucania, which also I have seen, remains liquid all the year round.

Whilst, therefore, giving fullest weight to Fr. Thurston's deductions from a wide range of similar phenomena, I venture to submit that what I have seen and here narrated seems still beyond any natural explanation.

IAN R. GRANT.

[As there can be no wish to misrepresent the data of the problem which is created by these blood liquefactions, we very gladly welcome this clear and sober statement of the observations of an eye-witness. The articles to which Captain Grant refers made no claim to supply an adequate explanation of the mystery. The last of the series declared explicitly : " with regard to the whole problem of these blood-miracles, I can only confess myself to be infinitely puzzled, without having any definite solution to propound." All the same, it is not so plain to the present writer that the facts attested by Captain Grant are irreconcilable with the conjecture propounded that the liquefaction may be due to the combined influence of light and heat. The St. Januarius relic at Naples under the least favourable circumstances liquefies in a few hours, but it also hardens again in a few hours. The Ravello relic, it appears, when once liquefied, " remains liquid for rather more than six weeks." May it not be that the process of liquefaction in this case is as deliberate as that of solidification. According to Captain Grant's own account, the liquefaction which began to be perceptible on July 23rd was not completed until July 27th. We would suggest that by the end of July the heat and light of a normal Italian summer bring about a liquid condition, but that as September is reached the gradual diminution in heat and light allow the relic to revert to the solid state.—H.T.]

POPE GREGORY XIII. AND PLOTS TO ASSASSINATE ELIZABETH.

As the subject of plots for the assassination of Queen Elizabeth and of the part played therein by Pope Gregory XIII. has again, in a discussion to which it was wholly irrelevant, been recently brought to the notice of the public,¹ it may be well to remind our readers that the question has been thoroughly discussed in this periodical some twenty-five years ago by the late Father John Pollen.² These two articles, in which he treats professedly of assassination plots, still remain the most minute and detailed examination of the subject that we possess. It is true that, in the Humphrey Ely case of 1580, he had not, at the time of writing, found the reply (December 12, 1580) of Cardinal Como, the Secretary of State, to the Nuncio Segu, printed later by Professor Meyer,³ but he had surmised its approval of the assassination of Queen Elizabeth from a letter of Segu to Dr. Allen. The two other cases he discusses, in which Cardinal Como and the Pope were implicated, are the so-called conspiracies of George Gifford and of Dr. William Parry. The letters exchanged between the papal officials extend, in the Gifford plot, from May 2 to May 30, 1583, and, in the Parry plot, from December 10, 1583, to February 20, 1584. The wording of them is somewhat vague and indefinite; but taking into account the opinion already expressed by Cardinal Como in 1580, there seems little doubt that they indicate a deplorable toleration and even approval of attempts on the Queen's life.

It is only fair to add that Cardinal Como, and, still less, the Pope, took no initiative in schemes of the kind. The Secretary unhappily approved, and allowed to proceed, plots believed to be already in existence, and was ready to take advantage of them when effected: and in two out of the three cases this approval was elicited by hostile artifices. Parry and Gifford might almost be called *agents provocateurs* of fictitious schemes. Moreover, it must be remembered that Pope Gregory took no personal interest in political matters, leaving the care of his State affairs to Cardinal Como. This Secretary of State, Hübner tells us, "studiously avoided speaking to the Pope oftener than was necessary upon political matters, represented things to him in their most favourable light, spared him all mental labour, postponed matters difficult to resolve or prolonged indefinitely questions of an intricate nature."⁴ In all the plots it is the actual words of this secretary, not those of the Pope, that have come down to us; and although, as Father Pollen

¹ In a letter by the Bishop of Durham, *The Times*, March 6.

² THE MONTH 1902, June and July. Cf. also, J. H. Pollen, S.J., "Queen Mary and the Babington Plot," Introd. and pp. 169-173.

³ In "England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth," p. 491, from which the Bishop of Durham quotes it.

⁴ Hübner, Sixtus V., i. p. 136. Cf. Father Persons' "Memoirs," Catholic Record Society, Vol. II., 64, "Cardinal Como which then was Secretary and did all in matters of state."

remarks, Gregory XIII. cannot possibly be considered a stranger to a policy which his secretary repeatedly approves in his name, he might conceivably have been more cautious and qualified and regardful of morality in his utterances.

Up to 1580 "there had not been one charge of plotting against Elizabeth's life brought by Protestants against Catholics, nor is there any known to us from other sources."¹ The assassination conspiracies, real and fictitious, to which the Secretary gave approval, all occur within the space of four years, from November 1580 to February 1584. They were an effect of the Ban proclaimed in 1580 by Philip II. against William of Orange, from which, morally speaking, the Band of Association (1584), which threatened Mary Queen of Scots, has little to differentiate it. "After Orange had been murdered and the ban had lapsed, the atmosphere cleared. Charges of murder plots again become very rare and they are evidently fictitious. Catholics never discuss them and we find the next Pope, Sixtus V. taking a strong position against any abuses in the matter."²

The sixteenth century, it must be also remembered, was a very rude and barbarous age. Political assassination was lightly regarded. Describing strife in Scotland in the middle of the century, Andrew Lang writes: "The current ideas of both parties on 'killing no murder' were little better than those of modern anarchists. It was a prevalent opinion that a king might have a subject assassinated, if to try him publicly entailed political inconveniences."³ Knox' joyful approval of the murder of Cardinal Beaton, his proclaiming that the extermination of idolaters (*i.e.* Catholics) was the clear duty of Christian princes and magistrates, and failing them, of all individual believers, the calm acceptance by Cecil of the impending assassination of Rizzio, the attempts made on the life of Dr. Allen,⁴ the murderous attitude Leicester, Walsingham and the Puritans took up towards Mary Queen of Scots,⁵ the efforts, in 1572, of Burleigh and the English ministers to bribe the Scots to take their Queen from England and kill her,⁶ are only some instances of the low state of political morality amongst our own countrymen. In condoning such policies Gregory XIII. acted on the assumptions of his age. The pity is that he did not rise superior to it and condemn such attempts, as did the secular priest Watts and the Jesuits, Creighton and Southwell:—for whatever extenuation may be found in the spirit of the age, the letters of approval remain, as Father Pollen wrote, "simply detestable, and

¹ "Queen Mary and the Babington Plot," xx. Father Pollen adds in a footnote, "I am speaking broadly. Of course plots were (falsely) reported at times of excitement, such as followed the Rising of the North. But no formal charges were preferred, no evidence was proposed, there were no indictments formed."

² *Ibid.* xx.

³ A. Lang, "John Knox and the Reformation," p. 17.

⁴ Cf. Knox, "Letters of Cardinal Allen."

⁵ Cf. Dr. Lettenhove, "Marie Stuart," pp. 55—74.

⁶ Cf. Hosack, "Mary Queen of Scots," i., 146 ff.

no one will blush more for them than those who admire Pope Gregory most."

But it would be manifestly wrong to conclude from this particular Pope's failings in the matter that the Holy See, as the Bishop of Durham would have us believe, was continually promoting assassination conspiracies against Elizabeth, thus threatening her life and justifying her persecution of Catholics. The ideas, as said above, were never suggested by the Pope; they were confined to the period of the Ban, were quickly dropped, and never brought the Queen's life into a moment's danger. Pope Sixtus V., Gregory's successor, adopted a very different line of conduct. He told Pisani that it had been proposed several times to him to assassinate the Queen and for a small sum, but that he had rejected such proposals, detesting and abhorring means of that kind.¹ Sixtus voiced herein the teaching of Catholic morality which holds human life so sacred that it can never be taken save by just process of law, *i.e.*, through the authority of God who gave it.

L. H.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

The Motives of Emancipation.

As the happy centenary of Catholic Emancipation approaches, it becomes increasingly interesting to recall the conditions in which Catholics found themselves a hundred years ago, as contrasted with their present, and especially to note the attitude of the then dominant Anglican Church, whose Bishops strenuously opposed this act of justice, to the poor and scanty remnants of Catholicism which it had tried to exterminate. Here is a comment, extracted from *The Times* of February 28, 1828, on the repeal, which preceded the general Act, of some of the persecuting laws, a comment which shows the true spirit of the Establishment (*italics ours*) :—

The majority of forty-four in the House of Commons, on Tuesday night, in favour of a repeal of the celebrated Test and Corporation Acts, is in truth what may be called a thundering event. It will sound from one end of the Kingdom to the other, and the echo will be heard in foreign parts. Were we of opinion that this division indicated any coolness of religious principle generally, or that it even marked any indifference, any want of predilection, to the established mode of faith, we frankly own that we should deplore it. But conceiving the majority to be founded on a conviction that the church is secure in her own strength,—is confident in the superior purity

¹ Hübner, "Sixtus V." English Translation, I, 351.

of her own doctrines, and the preeminent excellence of her own discipline and ordinances, and that she can therefore concede, without hazard, unfettered freedom to her rivals,—we trust that we may hail the event, as it was hailed when the result of the division was declared in the House of Commons.

In other words, Emancipation was to be granted, not as an act of justice, not as release from the provisions of a bigoted tyranny, but simply because the persecuted Catholics and Nonconformists were too insignificant to be feared. Even so, the boasted security of the Established Church proved illusory. Its history shows that, so far as it has progressed at all, it has progressed by trying to recover Catholic doctrines discarded at the Reformation. Without their help, it has lapsed into indifferentism, seceded to Nonconformity, abandoned Christianity altogether in favour of Modernism, and “the pre-eminent excellence of her own discipline and ordinances,” supposing for a moment its existence, has long been lost in a welter of lawlessness and inefficiency. “Her rivals” far outnumber her: the Church of the Nation can boast only one-sixth of the population: nothing but the bond (or fetters) of the State keeps it from lapsing into a dozen sects. In the days of its power, it persecuted the Church of God, and now it is reaping its just reward.

**Constructive
Work
for Peace.**

The peace of the world is, and will always continue to be, the greatest of human interests. In a sense this is recognized by the Press, which devotes considerable space to League of Nations' doings and sayings at Geneva. But there is not yet perceptible any general and constructive movement in public life towards peace. The Press has no conscience in the matter, and will always prefer a war-scare to the report of a disarmament conference. Many professional fighters and all munition-makers form a permanent combination to exploit the possibilities of war. Diplomacy is still swayed by the dual ideas of fear and force. The great Powers, one and all, cling to the advantages which their strength confers, and, instead of trying to equip the World Court with a common international code and a general sanction, still act as if they, unlike the smaller nations, were not amenable to law. Senator Dandurand, Canada's representative on the League Council, a man who has a clearer idea of the meaning of peace and justice than many of his colleagues, recently said (January 31st):

Our own necessities happen to be on the same lines as the necessities of humanity, and it is our duty to preach, and to continue to preach, the gospel of arbitration between peoples. It is not an easy matter for great nations to forgo their power, and place themselves on a level with smaller nations before a World Court, but I cannot help thinking that it is the only

way whereby we can make any advance towards permanent peace throughout the world.

The Senator was referring to the continued refusal of the British Government to sign the Optional Clause of the Permanent Court of International Justice, established in 1921. The original statutes, owing to the opposition of France and England, ordained that a case could be tried before the Court only with the consent of both parties. But a Clause abrogating that restriction was added, which States who adhered to the Court (*i.e.*, all those belonging to the League of Nations) could sign if they wished, and which was therefore called Optional. France has signed it and so, we know, has Germany: only Great Britain amongst the great European Powers holds out. The reason is stated, apparently with no cynical implication, by *The Saturday Review* (February 18th) in the following words:—"Great Britain is opposed to all-inclusive arbitration, because she fears that Egypt or Abyssinia might cite her before the Permanent Court at the Hague." If the paper is right, our Government will not have its conduct towards certain small nations discussed by any outside and independent authority. Considering that the only cases referable to the Court are those called legal or justiciable, this attitude is hardly in keeping with the change of international relations induced by the League, and it suggests the suspicion that this country is not always sure of the justice of its dealings. The Optional Clause, however, is making its way. It has been signed so far by twenty-seven States and is in actual operation between fourteen.

Racial Hate in "G. K's Weekly." For once we are tempted to rejoice that *G. K's Weekly*, a paper which embodies so much of the Catholic social ideal and bears the name of a foremost champion of the Catholic cause, has not a very big circulation. For in the issue for March 3rd there occurs a paragraph, written surely by some irresponsible subordinate, which evinces such a foolish and unCatholic spirit that its wide dissemination might well cause a scandal if presented without contradiction. The sentences run (*italics ours*):—"We insist that Prussia was *wholly guilty* of the war of aggression let loose in 1914. We insist that the *whole German nation* (with a few individual exceptions), not merely acquiesced, but *heartily co-operated* in the well-laid scheme to gain world-domination." This is surely the indictment of a nation carried to a ridiculous extreme. No journal has been more insistent than *G. K's Weekly* on the breakdown of the Parliamentary System in England and its supplanting by a financial oligarchy and a powerful press-trust. We are assured, and it is evident enough, that the average voter, because of ignorance, because of apathy, because of the reign of falsehood, has little or no influence on the policies of the State, and consequently

little or no responsibility. Are we then to saddle the whole German nation, whose Government then was even less responsive to the will of the people than is ours, and of whom at least one-third profess the Catholic faith and morality, with a conscious and deliberate design to enslave the earth? The notion is one which can have sprung only from an unChristian and indiscriminate racial hatred, unworthy of a reasonable man, and wholly out of place in a paper professing to expound the Catholic ideal. And it becomes all the more repulsive when we consider that it has been the aim of every great Power, Great Britain no less than others, to achieve, if possible, that political domination which is thought necessary for commercial supremacy. Many Catholics will be led to feel less confidence in the social gospel preached by *G.K.'s Weekly* if it shows itself so wildly astray in its view of international relations, actual and ideal.

"The Observer" For our part, we hold that the remarks of *The Observer*, which *G.K.'s Weekly* quotes only to more repudiate as "nonsense and wicked nonsense," Christian. are much more in harmony with the facts of history, and with the spirit in which we Catholics should interpret those facts, than the reactionary Jingoism we are condemning. *The Observer* said (February 26th):—

No German but feels the stigma of that unhappy paragraph of the Versailles Treaty which laid upon his country the whole guilt of the war; and the resentment against this imputation has found expression in a mass of aggressively apologetic literature which glorifies militarism by means of appeals to patriotic feeling. It is time that the Germans, too, should proclaim that this is not enough.

It is not enough for them nor for their fellow men. The whole world is afflicted by this controversy over war guilt and its responsibility. Argument and counter-argument are alike misguided. The wisdom of Burke holds; it is impossible to draw up an indictment against a whole nation. The very word war-guilt is a misnomer. Let us speak rather of war-folly or, more appropriately still, of war-tragedy, brought about by events utterly beyond the control of the men and women in all countries who were made their victims.

The last sentence, we own, needs qualification. We should probably not be far behind *G.K.'s Weekly* in denouncing the militaristic clique which jockeyed the puppet Kaiser into a declaration of war. The whole ethic of militarism comes straight from the Pit and affronts the essential Justice of Almighty God. But that the war occurred when and how it did was merely an accident of world-politics. The international morality of pre-war Europe had

long abandoned the rule of Christianity. Nothing but force or fear determined the mutual attitudes of governments. There was not enough conscience in Europe to react against such crimes as the Partition of Poland, the bombardment of the Danish Fleet, the seizure of Schleswig, the spoliation of the Holy See, the annexation of Bosnia. The Prussian only carried to an extreme policies which were more or less developed everywhere. No one has a right to denounce him who does not first openly lament the past injustices of his own State. Even to-day there are militarists in plenty amongst us, in spite of the war and all that it has taught. A provincial newspaper to hand¹ provides an opportune exhibition of their mentality, in the following extract from a letter by a certain colonel, President of a local branch of the British Legion :—

I personally strongly object to the limitation of armaments, as I honestly believe that the only way to keep and ensure peace is by having a very strong army and navy. No nation or person can keep peace without they have a strong force to back up their opinions.

As regards the League of Nations, in my opinion, anyone who advocates such ideas is either a traitor, rogue, or lunatic.

As regards shaking hands with our enemies (not for me) they are much better dead. No sensible man would take their word on oath or otherwise, nor even if written on a "scrap of paper."

I feel very strongly on this matter

When men feel very strongly they seldom think very deeply, and we may perhaps excuse the writer as being mentally incompetent to follow out the logical consequences of his feelings. It is because we fear that the author of the offending passage in *G.K's Weekly* would take his stand with the fire-eating and ungrammatical colonel that we feel bound to call attention to that ill-judged outburst of his.

**Folly
of
Racial Pride.** The excellent little monthly, *Bulletin Catholique International*, the motto of which is " Pax Christi in Regno Christi," quotes the following extract from the Preface to an old (1863) *Histoire de Paris* by a certain Amédée Gabourd, " sans doute dans sa vie privée un erudit modiste et pacifique," as the periodical kindly surmises :—

La France est à la tête du monde et Paris est le cœur de la France. C'est de Paris que rayonne la civilisation sur notre patrie et sur toutes les nations du continent européen. . . . Paris gouverne toutes les races par la puissance du génie, de l'intelligence et de la pensée, et par l'expansion de toutes

¹ *Western Morning News*, Mar. 2nd.

les idées, bonnes ou mauvaises. On cherche à nier son autorité, mais on est constraint de la subir. Vainement, on veut la paralyser, la circonscrire, la rendre nulle : Paris, comme le géant de la fable, ne peut se remuer sur sa couche sans ébranler le monde, et, de toutes parts, c'est de cette ville suzeraine des royaumes et des empires qu'on attend le mot d'ordre et le signal.

We do not reproduce these naïve remarks in order to contradict them, or to throw scorn on the nation in whose language they are uttered, but simply as an apposite illustration, *to be paralleled in every country* in the Old and New World, of racial conceit masquerading as patriotism, and of a mentality which hinders peace between nations simply because it hinders understanding. National boasting is just as much a sign of ignorance, vanity and bad manners as personal boasting, yet the press and the platform are full of it. Anonymous "editorials," being undeterred by the decent feeling that prevents individuals from self-advertisement, revel in a national self-complacence which, as the *Bulletin* remarks, "à l'étranger, risque fort de paraître le signe d'un intolérable orgueil." So long as national pride—the sort that leads to ignoring national shortcomings and emphasizing the defects of other nations,—is hymned as a virtue in school-histories and in the popular press, the spread of Christ's peace amongst the nations will be retarded. At Geneva the Powers continue to discuss material limitation of armaments and lose themselves in a maze of technicalities, but the progress of moral disarmament, the putting aside of the desire to advance national interests by force rather than by process of law, is even less evident. Even quite recently we have witnessed a strong Power, not for the first time, adopting a hectoring and offensive attitude towards a weak Power, which it would not dare to assume towards an equal—an exhibition rather of cowardice than of proper self-respect, and in any case quite unworthy of a civilized state. Surely the war has taught us that the use of the Big Stick is bad international form.

**The
Outlawry of
War.**

It is a singular thing that the most radical proposals for the prevention of war have come from nations which do not belong to the League, though they take a part in some of its activities.

Soviet Russia has proposed complete material disarmament : the United States, complete moral disarmament. Of the two proposals, the latter is the more necessary because the more effective. Without arms, no doubt, nations could not well fight, although they might improvise weapons to meet an emergency. But without the will to fight, following the outlawry of war, people would not need arms of whatever kind : material disarmament, therefore, would seem to be a logical consequence of moral,

but not *vice versa*. The Russian proposals were first made known in December last at a meeting of the Geneva Conference to set up a "Security and Arbitration Committee," the reference of which was "to consider the measures capable of giving to all States the guarantees of arbitration and security necessary to enable them to fix the level of their armaments at the lowest possible figures in an international disarmament agreement,"—in fewer words, how to secure international peace and justice without relying merely on force. No discussion of the Soviet Convention took place at what was merely a meeting to settle procedure but it was officially accepted for consideration. Though at first these proposals were generally regarded as wholly unpractical suggestions, designed to put the "Capitalist" Powers in the wrong, public opinion has come to see something more significant and helpful in them, and even Lord Cushendun, the British representative, undertook to examine them seriously. They are at present impracticable rather from the nations' want of will than for intrinsic reasons. They are well thought out, and take account of the permanent necessity of policing the world. If carried out they would achieve at one stroke what the League of Nations has been aiming at for more than six weary years with little success. They would save the British taxpayer something like £115,000,000 a year in preparation for war. Furthermore, they are not put forward as an ultimatum, but as a basis for discussion: the Russians will help in any practical plan for limitation. And, finally, as we have said, they are only the complement of Mr. Kellogg's scheme for the universal outlawry of war, which is at present before the nations of the League. They formed one of the many disarmament plans and memoranda,—six in all,—submitted to the Security Committee, which sat from February 20th to March 7th and then adjourned till June; they have been formally presented to the Council of the League, in session from March 5th to March 10th, and are now under discussion by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference which opened on March 15th and is still in being, and are sure to evoke severe criticism, if only because they ignore the League.

Moral and Material Disarmament to be pursued together. On the two ways of establishing peace and security—one by limiting armaments and the other by outlawing war—the nations seem divided in mind. One group in which France is conspicuous wants effective security before armaments are reduced: the other headed by an already disarmed Germany naturally wishes to proceed by drastically cutting down the means of aggression. There is a danger that the attainment of the one end may be delayed by discordance of means. The obvious plan is to use both means simultaneously. The prolonged debate between France and the United States, as to whether a bilateral agreement to discard war as an instrument of policy should precede a multilateral,

has produced some important pronouncements. It will be remembered that last December Mr. Kellogg, U.S. Secretary of State, suggested that France and the States should combine to ask the rest of the Powers to renounce armed force in international relations, and M. Briand answered in January that League obligations implied a duty to fight unjust aggression. Mr. Kellogg was not discouraged, and on February 27th said, *inter alia* :—“ I am reluctant to believe that the provisions of the Covenant of the League of Nations really stand in the way of the co-operation of the United States and members of the League of Nations in a common effort to abolish the institution of war ”— a “ statement which (as *The Times* remarked on March 3rd) cannot be forgotten,” as “ it suggests a new development.” Mr. Kellogg has, we think, logic on his side when he urges that if France, as she herself proposed, is free, as far as the League is concerned, to conclude a bilateral treaty discarding war, she is free to join in a universal multilateral treaty for the same end : in a word, members of the League can do collectively what they can do individually. And he appositely points out that the recent sixth Pan-American Havana Conference, representing twenty-one States of the New World, all but four belonging to the League of Nations, adopted a resolution “ condemning war as an instrument of national policy in their mutual relations.” Moreover, so absolute is his anti-war attitude that he will not confine the denunciation of war to wars of aggression. He wishes all war to be abolished.

War sometimes
an Evil too Great
to Justify.

Here we have the “ new development ” which impressed *The Times*. In Christian ethics, wars of defence, in certain circumstances, are justified, may be praiseworthy, may as a last resort be necessary. Mr. Kellogg, in view of the fact that, “ from the broad standpoint of humanity and civilization, all war is an assault upon the stability of human society,” would have the nations of the world, in the common interest, renounce their personal right to defend their interests in this particular way. He voices, in fact, a growing conviction that the physical and moral evils of modern warfare are so great and so widespread that no object is great and good enough to counterbalance them. It is as if a man could defend himself against unjust attack, only by some action which involved many of his neighbours also in loss of life or limb. In such a case, the claims of charity would outweigh the rights of justice. As applied to nations this opens up an interesting question, the bearing of which moralists will have to consider. If a nation can protect its integrity and independence only by inaugurating a world-wide war, uncertain of issue as regards its original object, but sure to let loose on mankind, including itself, a host of gigantic evils, is such a nation justified in setting

a match to the powder? Not, we may surely answer, if there exists any other means of self-protection, such as the Permanent Court of International Justice. If Mr. Kellogg, therefore, wishes to round off and complete his plans for outlawing war, he must provide a substitute for the means of security, inadequate and precarious though they be, which a readiness to fight affords. In other words, the United States must give its adhesion and support to the World Court, and urge on the codification of international law which is needed for its efficient working. Mr. Kellogg is no visionary; in a recent speech,¹ he recognizes that even his multi-lateral Pact will need to be supplemented by an "aroused public conscience." "The efforts of statesmen to advance the cause of world peace can only be regarded as a portion of the problem." We have to counteract the influence of the pessimists and the militarists and the financial interests which find voice in the irresponsible press; we have emphatically to repudiate what *The Times* calls "the assumption . . . that a heightened popular consciousness of wealth and power might best be expressed in the perfecting of an instrument of war."

**Anglicanism
not Spiritually
Independent.**

The Re-revised Prayer Book has assumed its final form with which it must once more solicit the suffrages of the civil power. Some of the Anglican Bishops, in spite of the notorious facts

of the situation, still speak of the "spiritual independence" of their Church. The *Church Times* even claims that, if the Prayer Book passes, "the Church will have maintained its independence," forgetting that permission is just as much an exercise of the will of Parliament as is refusal. The Anglican Church cannot maintain what it never had. All that Elizabeth left it was, besides of course the temporal possessions of the old Church, the function of preaching (heresy) and the administration of (invalid) sacraments. Ecclesiastical jurisdiction was expressly reserved to the Crown. Elizabeth, in the Commission for the consecration of Parker, "supplied" from the plenitude of her own jurisdiction for any defect in the subject, ministers or form of the consecration process, and the whole result is aptly summarized by Froude² in well-known words, both eloquent and true. After stressing the wholly spiritual nature of the Catholic episcopate—a "thing rooted like a rock on the adamantine basements of the world"—he goes on to contrast it with the hierarchy rooted on Matthew Parker.

The Anglican hierarchy, far unlike its rival, was a child of convulsion and compromise: it drew its life from Elizabeth's throne, and, had Elizabeth fallen, it would have

¹ To the American Council on Foreign Relations, March 15th.

² "History of England" (1870 edit.). Vol. VI., p. 301. (Italics ours.)

crumbled into sand. *The Church of England was as a limb lopped off from the Catholic trunk* : it was cut away from the stream by which its vascular system had been fed : and *the life of it as an independent and corporate existence was gone for ever.* But it had been taken up and *grafted upon the State.* If not what it had been, it could retain *the form* of what it had been,—the form which made it respectable, without the power which made it dangerous. The image in its outward aspect, could be *made to correspond* with the parent tree ; and to sustain the illusion, it was necessary to provide bishops who could *appear* to have inherited their powers by the approved method as successors of the apostles.

Froude was a thorough Erastian and a bitter anti-Catholic, but his diagnosis of what occurred to the Church in England, in Elizabeth, cannot be upset. She lost everything but the Faith,—canonical structure, material possessions, the adherence of a gradually-growing number of her English members. After the expulsion of the Catholic hierarchy she maintained a precarious foothold in the land in spite of efforts to exterminate her, until she was revived, never again to reach so nigh to extinction, by the advent of Cardinal Allen's seminary priests. And the creature of the State, which took her place at the price of bondage, finds in those bonds its only present safeguard against disintegration.

Martyrdom
disproves
Continuity.

In his controversy with Cardinal Bourne in *The Times*, the Anglican Bishop of Durham could not see, or would not face, his Eminence's argument that the martyrdom of so many Catholics under the Tudors and Stuarts proved that a change of religion had taken place. Men do not part with their lives for trivialities or fancies, nor do they turn mere fashions of ritual into grave matters of conscience. The martyrs died because they would not adopt the new religion professed by their persecutors. The Bishop with singular obtuseness thought to rebut this argument by saying that all that martyrdom proved was the sincerity of those that suffered it, not the truth of their beliefs : the Catholic Church " had a dismal preeminence among the Christian Churches in the matter of martyr-making persecution." Waiving the truth of that statement, we may note that, if true, it but confirms the Cardinal's argument. The victims under Mary are as strong a proof of Anglican discontinuity as are those put to death by Elizabeth. Churches do not persecute those of their own faith. The Bishop of Durham now poses as a champion of the spiritual independence of Anglicanism : he was once a manifest Erastian : previous to that an " Anglo-Catholic " : his ecclesiastical evolution is neatly summed up in an editorial note in *The Universe* for March 16th. He would doubtless repudiate now his repudiation of Anglican

continuity made at a Church Congress in 1908. He has evidently a capacity for receiving new impressions. Some day we may hope he will get a true view of the character of Queen Elizabeth, whom it pleases him now to call "a patriotic and high-souled Sovereign." Religious prejudice is very apt to warp historical judgments; the coarse immoralist, Luther, for instance, is almost canonized by his followers; but even Protestant historians would, we fancy, shrink from calling the daughter of Anne Boleyn "high-souled."

Grimsound.

The suggestive article by the Lord Abbot of Buckfast on the possibility of the ancient hut-circle on Dartmoor, called Grimsound, being in reality the remains of a laura or community of seventh-century Celtic monks has naturally excited some interest in the West Country. Mr. Henry Jenner, F.S.A., formerly one of the British Museum experts in Celtic antiquities, wrote on the subject to the *Western Morning News* (March 1st) explaining that he had long ago come to the same conclusion with regard to certain other hut-clusters in Cornwall. The editor, on the other hand, mentioned the opinion of a visitor from Iceland, who thought that Grimsound, as the name suggests, was not an ancient British village (nor of course a Celtic laura) but simply a fold for cattle. His, however, was a cursory investigation and leaves unexplained much of the structure. We understand that Devon antiquarians are planning a thorough examination of Grimsound this summer when, no doubt, all theories will be carefully explored.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Conscience not autonomous [A. O'Neill, O.P., in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1928, p. 289].

Creation, Purpose in [J. J. Walsh, M.D., in *Catholic World*, March, 1928, p. 736].

Miracle and Scientific Criticism [J. Fulton Sheen, D.D., in *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1928, p. 255].

Sacrifice, The Idea of [M. Lepin in *Revue Apologetique*, March, 1928, p. 257].

Unity, How Secured in Christ's Church [W. J. in *Catholic Gazette*, March, 1928, p. 76].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Anglican Church Theories erroneous [J. Keating, S.J., in *Month*, April, 1928, p. 334].

Anglicanism essentially heretical [*Universe*, March 2, 1928, p. 12].

Catholic Moral Teaching vindicated by a Norwegian Court [J. La Farge, S.J., in *America*, March 10, 1928, p. 528].

Catholic University of Ireland: Sketch of [L. M'Kenna in *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, March, 1928, p. 225].

Church History, How perverted in England [Sir B. Windle in *Homiletic Review*, March, 1928, p. 599].

Dogmatic Principle, Decline of, outside the Church [C. Bruehl, D.D., in *Homiletic Review*, March, 1928, p. 581].

Freemasons, English, in communion with Foreign ["Nestor" in *Catholic Times*, March 9, 1928, p. 7].

Gregory XIII. and Assassination Plots [L. Hicks in *Month*, April, 1928, p. 359].

Inge's "Protestantism," Dean, exposed by G. K. Chesterton [*Universe*, March 16, 1928, p. 8].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Bossuet, Tercentenary of [H. Kelly in *Studies*, March, 1928, p. 108].

Catholic Education a Natural Protest against Secular [P. L. Blakeley, S.J., in *America*, Feb. 11, 1928, p. 440].

Catholic Ethics of Peace [Report of American Catholic Association for International Peace: cf. *Commonweal*, Feb. 24, 1928: Peace, The Promotion of, J. McGrath in *Thought*, March, 1928, p. 529].

China; Chances of Peace in [G. Byrne, S.J., in *The Rock*, Jan., Feb., 1928].

Democracy in Catholic Teaching [M. F. X. Millar, S.J., in *Thought*, March, 1928, p. 594].

English Martyrs not reactionaries [D. Pontifex, O.S.B., in *Blackfriars*, March, 1928, p. 135].

Paulist Community (1858—1928), The [*Catholic World*, March, 1928, p. 823].

Peace, The Cause of, at the Havanna Pan-American Conference [M. Jordan in *Commonweal*, March 14, 1928, p. 1170: G. W. Hinman in *America*, March 10, 1928, p. 333].

Poltergeists [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Studies*, March, 1928, p. 51].

Russia, The New: exhaustive account of [*Documentation Catholique*, March 3, 1928, p. 545].

Spiritualism, Recent [H. Thurston, S.J., in *Month*, April, 1928, p. 289].

Traynor, John, The Case of: cured at Lourdes [H. W. Wallack in *Pilgrim's Script*, March, 1928, p. 49].

REVIEWS

1—SPIRITUAL BOOKS¹

THE first falls into two parts : an historical essay on the state of the Church (particularly in France) during the latter half of the fourteenth century, and on the commanding part which the illustrious Chancellor of the University of Paris took in the reform of that distressing period : and secondly, a close study of the spiritual doctrine and inner life of this remarkable man. Jean le Charlier was born, the eldest of twelve children, in 1363, at the village of Gerson in the Diocese of Rheims, whence he took the name by which he is now universally known. After a brilliant course of studies, and with an already widespread reputation as a theologian and preacher, he was at the age of thirty-two appointed Chancellor of Nôtre Dame and of the University of Paris.

It was the time of the Great Schism. Boniface IX. reigned at Rome, Benedict XIII. at Avignon. Gerson lived to see three Popes claiming simultaneously the Throne of Peter, and he died in the year 1429 in which by the resignation of "Clement VIII.," who had been elected by the four Cardinals of Benedict's allegiance, complete unity was finally restored to the Church under Martin V. No wonder that at such a period of confusion and distraction the whole Christian world, clergy no less than layfolk, was in disorder. Reform from top to bottom was an urgent necessity, and, as was inevitable, much that was even worse than the prevailing evils which it professed to correct, rose up under that specious name. The Flagellants, the Beghards, the Hussites, and hosts of other deluded and deluding sects and societies thundered intemperate denunciations and poured out prophecies, warnings, and promises. Through all the storm the Chancellor of Paris moved as a moderating influence—not unscathed, for he was denounced on occasion by each of the warring parties—but always working unflinchingly with pen and tongue and by the example of his life towards the peace and reformation of which, in the end, he lived to recognize the return.

Obviously such a man must, with all his strenuous activities, have lived a profound interior life of prayer and union with God. It is therefore with no sense of unfitness that one reads the record, in this most captivating and scholarly work, of his precious con-

¹ (1) *John Gerson, Reformer and Mystic.* By James L. Connolly, M.A., S.T.B. Louvain : Librairie Universitaire. Illustrated. Pp. xviii, 392. Price not stated.

(2) *Victim Souls: A Doctrinal Essay.* By the Abbé Paulin Giloteau. Translated by L. M. G. Bond. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. xix, 277. Price, 7s. 6d.

(3) *Christian Spirituality.* By Père P. Pourrat. Vol. III. Translated by W. H. Mitchell. London : Burns, Oates and Washbourne. Pp. xii, 405. Price, 10s. 6d.

tribution to the Church's store of ascetical and mystical doctrine. If, as our author seems to prove once more as definitely, perhaps, as ever it can be proved, Gerson has no serious claim to the authorship of "The Imitation of Christ," which his countrymen sometimes so eagerly revindicate for him, at least he was the inspirer as well as the direct teacher of a spiritual doctrine at once so sublime and so practical that one need seek for him no other honours.

In the space at our disposal we can do no more than recommend the work of Father Connolly, and in particular the second part of it, most sincerely to all—and there are many to-day—who look for clear and simple guidance in the Way of the soul to God. That these were the outstanding qualities of his teaching is testified by the summary inscription placed upon his tomb by the monks of St. Paul's cloister in Lyons where he died: "Do penance and believe the Gospel."

Victim Souls has been written with the object of steadyng the devotion of those who stirred by the ideals of sacrifice and self-dedication which are, indeed, the ideals of the Christ-life, may be in danger of outrunning that prudence which is described by Cassian as the ruler of all the other virtues, and so of coming, not to the fulfilment of their desire, but to its frustration. The author is far from wishing to damp down enthusiasm; on the contrary, he would maintain it at a glow: but he fears for the endurance of the fire kindled, possibly, by transient impulse and fed mainly by emotion. He sets himself therefore soberly, but never declining from a high spiritual level of thought, to examine, and having examined to establish upon a firm basis—historical, dogmatic, moral and mystical—the "victim-impulse" which has been the spring of sanctity in every age of the Church and which, in spite of everything, exercises a specially strong and widening appeal to-day.

He holds out a hand, warningly indeed but on that very account the more helpfully, to those who "launch themselves with imprudence into these difficult ways": but for the "mediocre spirits, creatures of habit . . . cased in an armour of conventionality," he has nothing but a deserved contempt, very faintly tinged with pity.

The first part of the book shows the idea of sacrifice and of the voluntary victim expressing itself from the remotest times, often crudely, often with cruelty and ferocity, but branching off in the minds and practice of the Chosen People in a growth of refinement from the material, as real in itself, to the material as a symbol of spiritual reality, until, in the Christian thesis, it finds its authentic significance as the appropriation of the life of Christ. Here the "Dogmatic and Moral Survey," which constitutes the second part, adduces the teaching of the Fathers and of traditional theology, supported by the lives of the saints, in proof and explanation of the vital idea: and there are wise words on the practical needs of those in whom it has taken root.

The third part, which will hold the interested attention of all who have felt the attraction of this life, is especially notable for the sanity with which, while propounding the loftiest ideals of sacrifice and abandonment to the Will of God, it lays down and applies that sure test of all individual inspiration, conformity with the teaching and spirit of the Church. There is nothing in the book more valuable and inspiring than Chapter III. of this part, on "The Prayer of the Victim Soul." The very welcome characteristic of the work is precisely this, that while a generous soul will find in it help and encouragement for aspirations which it had perhaps hardly dared to formulate even to itself, the mere dreamer—the "collector" of mystical experiences—will draw from it no comfort for his insubstantial visions.

The third volume here reviewed is itself the third volume of a monumental work, the two previous volumes of which were reviewed in *THE MONTH* in August 1922 and March 1925. In this volume is contained what will be of immense service to many, an illuminating chronological account, all ready to hand, of the Schools of spiritual, and especially of mystical, teaching from the Renaissance down to the time of the Jansenist infiltration. According to the title-page this is only Part I. of that Section of the whole work entitled "Later Developments," so that a continuation of Père Pourrat's study of the subject into our own day may be hoped for later.

That an age of which Erasmus could write, "Of the common run of Christians think this: that none were ever more corrupt, even among the pagans, in their notions of morals": and Gerson, not so long before, defending, as it were with his back to the wall, the celibacy of the clergy, "*De duobus malis minus est incontinentes tolerare sacerdotes quam nullos habere*"—that such an age should have been the immediate forerunner of one of which the outstanding feature was to be a glory of sanctity, such as has perhaps never been equalled in the history of the Church, is due to something more than that reaction, that "swing of the pendulum," which no doubt may explain much of the contrasts of secular history. No one can fail to see in it the recurring phenomenon of God's saving and mysterious Providence which seems to allow the worst to grow worse that the best may be better, and to build by pulling down. St. Ignatius of Loyola, St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, St. Francis de Sales, St. Jane Frances de Chantal, St. Peter Alcantara, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John Eudes, the Oratory, the Foundation of St. Sulpice, and a host of other persons and influences too numerous to detail, sprang in vigorous growth from that befooled and wasted soil: a growth, too, harmonious in difference, with one end to a rich multiplicity of means, and one voice—as on the Day of Pentecost—in a diversity of tongues.

Père Pourrat extracts from each the pith and marrow of their teaching, and sets in contrast the mischievous aberrations, within

and without the Church, which only serve to exhibit more clearly the fundamental identity that exists under all the varying expressions of the several Masters. No reader, whether his interest in Mysticism be personal or merely speculative, can escape the fascination of these pages, and there must be many who will owe to them a lasting debt of knowledge and light not easily to be obtained elsewhere.

2—AN EARLY FATHER¹

MINUCIUS FELIX, both as a Latinist and as a Christian apologist, takes high rank. His dialogue the *Octavius* is described by Harnack as "elegant," by Halm "the little book of gold," Renan calls it the "pearl" of Aurelian apologetic, while Boissier judges it to be one of the masterpieces of early Christian literature (p.6). As a source for the history of Christianity, especially in its opposition to paganism, it is of the greatest value. The reverend author, in this biographical and literary study, has done his work well. His style is clear, and his argumentation, especially in the second half of the book, in which he successfully outlines and evaluates the critics' theories as to the date of the *Octavius*, is conscientious and convincing. He himself concludes for the priority of Minucius Felix as against the claim of Tertullian: but he wisely abstains from oracularly stating this result as a certain and undeniable fact. His discussion, in the first part, of the contents of the dialogue is a model of careful analysis and explanation: particularly interesting are the pages devoted to the "objective of Minucius" (pp. 145-200). Two morals seem to us to be conveyed by the book—first, that the scholar who confines himself to "classical" Latin is shutting his eyes to literature of the highest quality, and second, that internal evidence (which alone, practically, is available in the problem of the date of the *Octavius*) is capable of interpretation in contradictory senses, and is therefore a feeble weapon in the critics' hands.

The S.P.C.K. has again placed us in its debt by the publication of this book: it has already published a translation of the text of the *Octavius*. With this material at his disposal the general reader can be recommended to embark on the study of this most interesting treatise. And even for the Patrologist, the work of the Rev. H. Baylis will prove of great service.

3—SATAN REBUKES SIN²

THE first seven chapters of this book repeat, with some additions, most of the arguments against contraception of those writers who were first in the field. Although the author endorses

¹ *Minucius Felix and his Place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church.* By H. J. Baylis, M.A., D.D. London: S.P.C.K. Pp. 374. Price, 15s.

² *The Night-Hoers: or the Case against Birth-Control and an Alternative.* By Anthony M. Ludovici. London: Herbert Jenkins, Ltd. Pp. 288. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

the arguments of Christian writers he has a quarrel with them because they rely "upon Divine Law" and "use science only as a confirmation." In other words, Mr. Ludovici is an old-fashioned Free-thinker, who cannot understand the philosophy of Ultimate Causation, as held by Catholics and expounded in such easily accessible sources as the C.T.S. leaflets (See No. 37).

After Chapter VII. he uses his own unaided reason, with disastrous results. His description of Catholic teaching concerning parental responsibility is simply a travesty of truth, worthy of a Low Grade Protestant (a type he despises). He is opposed to Feminism, but fails to distinguish the essential difference in status between a female contraceptist, a Christian woman, and an unmarried "wife." Moreover, on page 184, he shows such insensitivity to foundation morals as to say of the wife of a contraceptist that, "if she be a Christian woman, law-abiding and honourable, she will, on apparently purely intellectual or spiritual grounds, seek out another man, who will understand her great soul better than her lawful mate does." And note, besides, the dreadful lapse from his own standards! A professed Atheist writing of "spiritual grounds" and of the "soul"!—the very phrases have a ring of reaction. And yet he can sneer at the "sob-stuff" of the contraceptists. The sheer farce of the words quoted is more clearly apparent on page 214 when the author, presumably a Nordic, tells us "it is *too much often forgotten* that it is only in connection with spiritual and intellectual things that boredom and monotony have any meaning." The four words I have italicized suggest, after all, that Mr. Ludovici, for all his flamboyant patriotism is not altogether Nordic. However, I wonder whether he has ever eaten cold mutton, or,—something more boring and monotonous—cold pork.

Then he writes many pages about degeneracy in quite a cheery old-fashioned way, apparently ignorant of the researches of the late Sir Frederick Mott, and of much else. On page 199 he announces that the practice he attacks is on "a very low evolutionary plane," because, forsooth, it is also practised by savages. Far be it from me to defend contraceptists, but, when Mr. Ludovici proposes infanticide as a remedy for our social ills, I suggest that this also—to use his own style of reasoning—is on "a very low evolutionary plane," being in fact practised by savages.

And who is to do the killing? On page 243 we read that "there could surely be no act more unnatural, more inhuman, than the killing of a baby by its mother." Now Mr. Ludovici censures the contraceptists because they do not understand the use of the words "natural" and "unnatural." But neither does he, because these words have no meaning whatsoever except with reference to the Natural Law whereby the Divine Will is expressed in Creation. Apart from that, infanticide is not unnatural. I once had a rabbit who ate her young. But what Mr. Ludovici thinks

unnatural in the mother, he thinks natural to the father. Thus "even the ancients left this unpleasant office to the father," and then he proceeds (page 250) :—"If the law does not move, it only requires a few brave, tactful and merciful fathers to lead the way in this direction, for the law to follow." Quite so, and the brave Ludovici will doubtless be present in Court when the sentence of death is pronounced. With that we leave the oldest farce in the world—the Atheist in the rôle of Moralist. Drop curtain, if you please, especially the fireproof one.

HALLIDAY SUTHERLAND, M.D.

SHORT NOTICES.

APOLOGETIC.

IT is significant that we should receive, at the same time, from almost opposite extremes, two books on the Society of Jesus. What is more significant, though they deal with quite different matter and points of view, yet both are obviously written with the same object, *i.e.*, to justify the ways of the Society of Jesus to men of the present generation. To take the first of these, *The Jesuits in Modern Times*, by John La Farge, S.J. (America Press, N.Y.: price, \$1.50). Here we have an able, open exposition, in which the average, progressive, American mind may see that the Society of Jesus, instead of being "a survival, an anachronism," is very much according to his own way of thinking. That he may discover this all that is needed is that the modern man should be made to understand aright the meaning of the vows, especially poverty and obedience, and the freedom that is built upon them. The rest is clear. There is something exceptionally frank and straightforward in the author's manner which makes this book particularly attractive. It is a book which should make not only friends but vocations. The second, *Zur Soziologie der katholischen Ideenwelt und des Jesuitenordens*, by Gustav Gundlach, S.J. (Herder: 4.50 m.), describes the Society from another standpoint. While the American author shows that the Jesuits are as modern as any of his readers would wish, the German Father is concerned to show that the whole plan and working of the Order is not a thing peculiar to itself, but is wholly built upon the Sociological principles of Christendom itself. He first lays down those principles; he shows them as they are illustrated in the plan of the Church; he then applies them to the Society of Jesus. What he has to say of the principles of Feudalism and Democracy as blended in the Society of Jesus is particularly interesting.

The first impression one receives on opening Mother Eaton's new book, *Our Inheritance, Doctrine for Catholic Colleges and Schools* (Longmans: 4s. 6d.), is the extraordinary amount of thorough work she has put into it. Such a book could only have been written by one who was in the habit of taking great pains, and who, before she set herself to her task, had spent a long time in collecting her material. Her illustrations, her stories, her explanations come from all manner of sources; her sub-divisions are worthy of a scholastic. The second feeling, when we look at her work more closely, is that Mother Eaton knows the mentality of those whom she addresses. She is not writing

for children; her book is for "colleges and schools"; and she understands, not only the limitations of young people of college age but, what is far more important, and far too often passed over, their capacities. Too many books are written down to the level of young people, not enough up to their standard; Mother Eaton knows that they are capable of much and she gives it to them generously. Nominally she has given us a commentary on the catechism, but in reality her book is very much more. It is an exceptionally good compendium of theology, and the summaries at the end of the chapters make this compendium still more precise. But besides, by means of illustrations and quotations, she so intermingles devotion of a solid kind with her theology that the book becomes one for spiritual reading. The chapter on "The Mother of the Redeemer" is admirable in this happy combination; but it is only one of many.

In *Lecciones de Apologética para uso de los cursos de Religión* (Barcelona, Tipographia Católica Casals: 2 Vols. 12.50 pesetas), by Rev. N. Marin Nogueruela, we have a book well worth translating into English. A text-book, yet with none of the text-book's tedium, it excites none of the prejudice some people are apt to feel against "Apologetics." For the author has the art of making the most abstract and difficult thoughts take shape and colour, and the fundamental Catholic truths are proved in a clear, easy and attractive style. Such statements, for instance, as little appealing to our imagination as "Our idea of God is analogical, not ontological," are here made as evident as a picture on the screen, for the various proofs are full of illustrations cleverly borrowed from History, Astronomy, Psychology, Biology, Zoology, Physics, Chemistry, and everyday life. Whilst accurately laying his finger on the points which suffer most at the hands of modern incredulity, he is fair to his adversaries, meeting them in their own ground and with their own weapons, and shirking no difficulty which the average Catholic is likely to be faced with in his dealings with Non-Catholics. A notable feature of the book is the résumé appended at the end of each volume giving a bird's-eye view of its argument.

The 24th fascicule in a "Cours Supérieur de Religion," which M. le Chanoine E. Duplessy is issuing, is devoted to *Le Culte dû à Jésus-Christ, à sa Mère et à les Saints* (Bonne Press: 25 cent.). Worship is due to God, and to persons and things associated with God, from His rational creatures. The Canon shows in clear detail the qualities and limits of each kind. From our Lord and His Saints creatures receive help towards Salvation: those graces too, and the means whereby they are won, are carefully defined.

DEVOTIONAL.

The latest additions to the "Orchard Series" (5s. and 7s. 6d.) of Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne are *The Secret Paths of Divine Love* and *The Mirror of Simple Souls*, by an unknown French mystic. The first is a treatise on affective prayer by a Capuchin Friar, Father Constantine Barbanson (1581—1632), translated into English by Dom Anselm Touchet, c. 1680, abridged by a nun of Stanbrook Abbey—that hive of literary industry—and finally edited, with a critical Introduction, by Dom Justin McCann, of Ampleforth. The treatise won the admiration of that master of spirit, Father Augustine Baker, and, in its modern dress, should find favour with all those whose conversation is in heaven.

The thirteenth century mystic who composed the book called *The Mirror of Simple Souls* in French has never attained the dignity of print till now, when an early English version of his work (ascribed to M.N.) has been carefully edited from the MSS. by Miss Clare Kirchberger, who has investigated all the sources and done all that scholarly research could do to determine the sense and spirit of the author. It was a treatise well worth rescuing from oblivion, written in semi-dialogue form and tracing out the usual path of perfection by detachment.

HISTORICAL.

Miss Cecil Kerr, in a quiet unostentatious way, continues to add good books to her list; this month we welcome a very readable one, *From Scotland's Past, Stories from Scottish History* (Sheed and Ward: 3s. 6d. n), intended for young people, and likely to make an excellent reader for a Scottish schoolroom. It deals with stories from the lives of some of the glories of the Scottish Church—St. David, St. Margaret, James I. of Scotland, William Elphinstone "the Good Bishop," Sir Andrew Wood, Mary of Guise. Miss Kerr's background is very full; while one reads her "stories" one learns much of other things, especially of the lives and times of the people. The book is illustrated by Phyllis Hodsell; there is character in the drawings.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

In *George Hay Forbes, A Romance in Scholarship*, by W. Perry, D.D. (S.P.C.K.: 7s. 6d. net), we have one of those records of life which strike one dumb with admiration of the brave spirit of man. Not only have we an account of one who, a paralytic from childhood, made himself acquainted with the chief libraries of Europe, and an acknowledged European authority on the liturgy of the Church; but, for us, there is the still more striking paradox of one who was so entirely in sympathy with the Catholic mind and Catholic practice, and yet was fundamentally opposed to much that to a Catholic is of the very essence of Catholicism. No reader can fail to admire the man; when, then, we come to emphatic disagreements we cannot quarrel; we can only wonder at the point of view which so clearly makes white appear black.

We are not told whether the sixth edition of M. Daurignac's *Histoire de Saint Louis de Gonzague* (Téqui: 10.00 fr.) has been revised, or to what extent, since it first appeared some sixty years ago, but the story narrated gives the traditional interpretation of St. Aloysius' character, based on the classic *Life of Cepari*.

The career of the great theologian who, in the second century, opposed the ravages of Gnosticism in France is adequately sketched by Abbé Christiani in *Saint Irénée* (Bonne Presse: 1.50 fr.).

Sainte Germaine Cousin (Bonne Presse: 1.50 fr.), by Francis Veuillot, gives the history of a humble shepherdess of Languedoc who lived only 22 years and died unknown in 1601. A generation and more after her burial her body was found incorrupt, and a succession of miracles revived the memory of her blameless life. She was not canonized till our own day in 1867.

NON-CATHOLIC.

Books for "plain people" continue to pour out from Anglican and other Protestant writers. Last month we had occasion to criticize

somewhat severely and at length one of such books; with the volumes before us we are more at ease, though, we fear, we cannot refrain altogether from adverse criticism. In **The Great Reality**, by the Rt. Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D., Lord Bishop of Edinburgh (Longmans: 6s. 6d. net), we confess to a certain enthusiastic hope at the outset; but when the author degenerates into a not too strong defence of his brother bishops for refusing Reservation, we felt somewhat disappointed. Again, we are not much in sympathy with his general condemnations; because he must blame his own church for its remissness, he must needs blame all the churches, especially, it would seem, our own. If his Lordship had confined himself to that which he knows from within, and had not judged of all Europe from a Spanish bull-fight, he would have written a better book.

Akin to this, and again written for plain people, is **Our Lord and Saviour** (Longmans: 4s. n.), a Study of the Person and Doctrine of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. Peter Green, M.A., Canon of Manchester. We admire the author's undoubted zeal; we congratulate him on being decided on such matters as the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection; we are struck by his many illustrations of the working of grace in men, taken from his own experience; we only wish the author would make a special study of grace itself and its effects; of the difference, in other words, between the natural and the supernatural. True, he acknowledges that "the knowledge of Christ is not a thing which any man can learn for himself, but rather something given freely to those able to receive it"; still we would suggest that the life supernatural is something very much more than the life of natural, if religious, emotion, and that the neglect to emphasize this is one of the weaknesses of Anglican theology.

Following on this we have **The Life Eternal: Here and Now** (Longmans: 3s. 6d. n.), by Alexander Nairne, D.D., Canon of St. George's, Windsor, and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. Though the book has "a practical aim," we are not sure that this time the author is writing for "the plain man"; if he is, then it would seem that he expects much from him. Dr. Nairne is an avowed exponent and follower of the Platonists; we admire him none the less for that. In the light of the Platonists he interprets much of the Old Testament, especially the idea of God; it is astonishing how much that he writes may be paralleled from Hindu and Buddhist philosophers. He criticizes the too great tendency to "concrete," as it were, our understanding of Christ, and of the next life. In the light of all this he re-reads St. John, and dwells on the *present tense* of the evangelist when he speaks of eternal life. To a Catholic this is not new; but once more, as we have been compelled to say already, it is the lack of demarcation between the natural and the supernatural which troubles us, and, we suspect, leads the author himself to vagueness as to such matters as the Resurrection.

POETRY.

Seventeenth Century Lyrics (Longmans: 10s. 6d.), edited by Mr. Norman Ault, is a volume for the student of literature even more than for the ordinary lover of poetry. The editor has secured for himself a name for careful research and accurate editing, and this collection is in no way inferior to his other, similar, work. The lyrics are arranged in chronological order, so that the student may watch the growth of the

mind of the century. Old friends naturally reappear, but there are many lyrics that are less familiar, some being entirely new, and giving evidence of very wide research.

A prose translation, although lacking only metre and rhyme to be verse, cannot, naturally, do justice to the devotional poems of "Theophilus," which Father Anthony Coppens, S.J., has published from the Flemish under the title **Hours with Christ** (Brepols' Catholic Press, Turnhout: 2s.). We have the substantial value of high thoughts and fine images, but, like uncut gems, they lose something of their power to impress. Still, poetic genius will out, and there is plenty of that in this beautifully-printed book, which, moreover, is adorned by several striking illustrations in colour.

The slender booklet called **The Sun and Other Poems**, which the author herself, Miss Helen Punch, publishes, exhibits careful technique at the service of a vivid imagination, but little originality of thought. However, there is nothing trivial in these verses and, although they centre about ordinary themes, they tell their tale with freshness and vigour. The book may be obtained from Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne.

FICTION.

From the *Bonne Presse* of Paris come five novelettes of the "Roman Bijou" class. They are sufficiently interesting to induce the beginner in French to use brain and dictionary in order to follow them, and, therefore, they will suit school libraries admirably. They are named respectively *Régine: Virtuose*, by René Duverne; *Jean Laroque*, by L. Olivière; *Le Petit Mécano*, by G. E-Le Conte; *Les Aventuriers de la Mer*, by A. Meunier; and *La 3me Génération*, by J. Danemarie.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The task before the missionary in China may be vividly realized in the eighth volume of Father Henry Doré's *Researches into Chinese Superstitions* (T'Usewei Printing Press: Shanghai), of which Father M. Kennelly, S.J., is again the translator. Like the previous volume which we reviewed as long ago as December, 1914, this follows with exemplary patience the legends, often puerile and fantastic, regarding Chinese gods, heroes and holy persons, and it is plentifully illustrated with coloured plates. Father Kennelly in his introduction discusses the nature and developments of Chinese Buddhism, an importation from India which has marvellously spread. It is to be hoped that that intelligent people will accept as readily the pure and reasonable doctrine of Christianity.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

We are glad to welcome from Hong Kong an old friend, **The Rock**, which, after several years of useful existence under the editorship of Colonel Bowen, succumbed in 1925 when he left the Colony. Now it has been revived by the Irish Jesuits who are working there at the University, and the January and February numbers give good promise of a fruitful career. Reliable news from China is a real desideratum here, and we look to the monthly appearance of *The Rock* to supply it. (Price, \$4.00 yearly).

Rarely has the C.T.S. produced a more timely pamphlet than the revised and enlarged edition of **Our Martyrs: a Chronological List**, by

the Rev. C. A. Newdigate, S.J., Vice-Postulator of the Cause, which gives within the compass of 36 pages a vast amount of information about those 360 heroes who were put to death in England for the Faith, between the years 1535 and 1681, giving the salient facts, wher- ever discoverable, of the lives of each, the cause and manner of his death, and the condition of his "process" at Rome. Nothing could be a better introduction to the study of the careers of the martyrs or a greater stimulus to their cultus than these clearly arranged and carefully compiled pages. Other reprints comprise *The Ven. Margaret Clitherow*, by the Revs. A. B. Gurdon and E. E. Levick; *Thoughts for Free-Thinkers*, by Mgr. Canon W. Barry; *Agnosticism*, by Rev. John Gerard, S.J.; *Humility*, by R. F. Clarke, S.J.; *St. Francis Xavier*; Mgr. Hugh Benson, by Rev. A. Ross, Cong. Orat. New pamphlets are *Galileo and other Alleged Failures of Infallibility*, by E. F. Chabot, S.J., which will enable people to answer the famous question—"What about Pope Honorius?" *The Pope's Men*, by Enid Dinnis; short studies of typical martyrs written with the author's usual grace and insight. Finally, *Benediction and Te Deum*, a penny leaflet.

There is little out of the common in the short life-story of *Kathleen Kirwan* (Sister Mary Bega), a Loreto lay-Sister, which Messrs. Burns, Oates and Washbourne publish at 2d. Child of a working-class family, she passed a blameless and laborious youth, was admitted to the Convent when 26 years old, and died after three years' residence there, being admitted to her vows on her death-bed.

The "Irish Messenger" Office publishes at 2d. a translation of Abbé Astruc's *The Mystic Mass*, a form of assisting at the Holy Sacrifice, combined with a formula for making the Morning Oblation.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

ASIA MAJOR, Leipsic.

Ceylon. By G. Schurhammer and E. A. Voretzsch. 2 Vols. Pp. xxxii. 727. Price (unbound). 50.00 m.

BENZIGER BROS., New York.

Ted Bascomb in the Cow Country. By Rev. H. J. Heagney. Pp. 172. Price, \$1.25. *Priestly Virtue and Zeal*. By the late Mgr. J.-L. F. Kirili. Pp. 179. Price, \$2.00 n. *The Patriots*. By Canon Guinan. Pp. 332. Price, \$2.50.

THE BRUCE PUBLISHING Co., Milwaukee.

Couriers of Mercy. By E. F. Garesché, S.J. Pp. 190. Price, \$1.50.

BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.

A Lancashire Man (*John Rigby*). Edited by C. A. Newdigate, S.J. Pp. ix. 46. Price, 6d. *Two Arguments for Catholicism*. By Ant. Eymieu. Translated by J. L. Stoddard. Pp. vii. 203. Price, 5s. *Spiritual Teaching of Louis Lallement*, S.J. Edited by A. McDougall. Pp. xvi.

301. Price, 6s. *Kathleen*

Kirwan. Price, 2d. *Revelations and Prayers of St. Gertrude*. From the Latin by Dom E. Graf, O.S.B. Pp. 88. Price, 2s. 6d. *Saint Marie-Madeleine Postel*. By Bishop Greente. Translated by Katharine Henvy. Pp. xiii. 194. Price, 3s. 6d.

CARMELITE GENERALATE, Rome.

Enucleatio Mysticae Theologiae S. Dionysii Areopagita. Edited by P. Anastasius of St. Paul. C.T.S., London.

Several new Twopenny Pamphlets and Reprints.

C.T.S., or IRELAND, Dublin.

Life of Matt Talbot. By Sir Jos. A. Glynn. Pp. viii. 10s. Price, 2s.

CENTRAL CATHOLIC LIBRARY, Dublin.
Catalogue of Novels and Tales by Catholic Writers. Edited by S. J. Brown, S.J. 2nd edit. Pp. xii. 50. Price, 1s. n.

EDITIONS SPES, Paris.
León Harmel: 1829—1915. By Georges Guitton, S.J. 2 Vols. Pp. xxii. 344. 437. Price, 35.00 fr.

HEATH CRANTON, London.
The Princess of Tears. By Sophie Maude. Pp. 327. Price, 7s. 6d.

HERBERT JENKINS, London.
The Night-Hoers. By A. M. Ludofici. Pp. 288. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

HERDER, Freiburg.
Zur Soziologie der Katholischen Ideenwelt und des Jesuitenordens. By Gustav Gundlach, S.J. Pp. 120. Price, 4.50 m.

KEGAN PAUL, London.
The Lives of the Popes in the Middle Ages. By Mgr. H. Mann, D.D. Vol. XIV. Pp. ix. 308. Price, 15s. n. *Pastor's History of the Pope's.* Vols. XV. and XVI. Edited by R. F. Kerr, Cong. Orat. Pp. xlviii. 442; xxii. 518. Price, 15s. each net.

LA BONNE PRESSE, Paris.
Five Romans Bijou:—Le Petit Mécano, Jean Laroque, La 3me Génération, Les Aventuriers de la Mer, Régine: Virtuose. Price, 3.00fr., 5.50fr. (bound); 2 plays: *St. Pierre devant le Sanhédrin* (2.00fr.); *Les Bandeaux Tombent* (4.00fr.). *Deux Articles de la Civilità Cattolica sur l'Action Française* (1.00 fr.). *La Pomme de Terre.* By C. Manclère. *Actes de Pie XI.* Tome I. (1922—23). Pp. 395. Price, 4.00 fr. *Meditations sur la Perfection.* By P. E. d'Alzon. Pp. xv. 463. Price, 12.00 fr. Several Musical pieces.

LETHIEU, Paris.
Formation de l'Enfant par le Catéchisme. By Abbé P. Bouvard. Pp. 300. Price, 12.00 fr. *Vers la Perfection Conjugale.* By A. Vuillermet, O.P. Pp. 256. Price, 12.00 fr.

LONGMANS, London.
Freedom within the Church. By Rev. A. E. F. Rawlinson, D.D. Pp. 15. Price, 1s. n. *The Education of Catholic Girls.* By Janet Erskine Stuart. 6th impression. Pp. xv. 257. Price, 3s. 6d. *Futile Sermons.* By Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A. Pp. 126. Price, 4s. 6d. n. *Dream of Gerontius.* Edited by "Anglican." Pp. viii. 102. Price, 7s. 6d. n.

MUSEUM LESSIANUM, Louvain.
Le Point de Départ de la Métaphysique. By J. Marechal. Cahier I. 2nd edit. Pp. 218. Price, 20.00 fr.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
The See of Peter. By J. T. Shotwell, Ph.D., and Louise R. Loomis, Ph.D. Pp. xxvi. 737. Price, 50s. n.

ST. JOHN'S ABBEY, Collegeville, Min.
The Funeral Mass and Burial Service, 10c. *The Manner of Serving Mass,* 5c.

SANDS & CO., London.
The Achievement of the Middle Ages. By W. E. Brown. Pp. 240. Price, 5s. n. *Recollections of a Ransomer.* By Rev. P. Fletcher. Pp. vii. 211. Price, 2s. 6d. n. and 3s. 6d. n. *Studies in Hebrew History.* By J. F. Smith. Pp. x. 173. Price, 4s. n.

SHEED & WARD, London.
The Kingdom and the World. By C. C. Martindale, S.J. Pp. 93. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Salt,* By Margaret Yeo. Pp. 350. Price, 7s. 6d. n. *The Layman's New Testament.* By Rev. Hugh Pope, O.P. Pp. xii. 912. Price, 2s. 6d. n. *Anglican Cobwebs.* By Rev. R. Knox. Pp. 59. Price, 1s. n. *The Pedigree of Fascism.* By Aline Leon. Pp. 236. Price, 10s. 6d.

S.P.C.K., London.
The Book of Ruth: Hebrew Text, with notes by A. R. S. Kennedy, D.D. Pp. 79. Price, 2s. 6d. *Baptismal Fonts.* By E. Tyrrell Green. Illustrated. Pp. xvi. 183. Price, 10s. 6d. n. *Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments.* By F. Gavin, Ph.D., Th.D. Pp. viii. 120. Price, 5s. n.

TEQUI, Paris.
Méditations sur les Sept Paroles. By the late Canon Chas. Perraud. 7^e édit. Pp. xxiii. 268. *Le Catéchisme en Problèmes: cours moyen.* By Canon Duplessy. Pp. x. 300. Price, 9.00 fr. *Résumés de Catéchisme.* By the Same. Pp. 58. Price, 1.50 fr.

THE COMMONWEALTH PRESS, Letchworth.
St. Peter and the Keys. By B. E. Warren. Pp. 50. Price, 1s.

THE VINE PRESS, Steyning.
The White Blackbird. By A. de Musset. Translated by Henrietta Tayler. Illustrated. Pp. vii. 30. Price, 2s. 6d. n.

WHEATON & CO., Exeter.
The Franciscans and Dominicans of Exeter. By A. G. Little and R. C. Easterling. Pp. 92. Price, 7s. 6d.

